

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1889.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE DELIAN LEAGUE.

THE latest German writers on Greek History, with some exceptions, seem to accept, either in the whole or in part, the account of the growth of the Delian league given by Kirchhoff in *Hermes* vol. xi. p. 1 ff. As I find myself quite unable to follow them, I venture to review the conclusions at which Kirchhoff arrives.

They are mainly these :

1. That the Aeolians and Ionians of the mainland of Asia Minor did not join the Delian league till after the battle of Eurymedon (465 B.C.).

2. That the Hellespontian allies mentioned by Thucydides (i. 89) were not really members of the Hellenic alliance.

3. That the cities of the Delian league were distributed into districts from the first.

4. That the first *phoros* could not have amounted to 460 talents, as Thucydides says.

5. That after his first recall to Sparta Pausanias became ruler of Byzantium ; that Sestos was reconquered by the Persians ; and that both cities were finally won for the Greeks by Cimon.

Let us examine the evidence on which these conclusions rest.

1. a. As to the Aeolians. It is of course stated by Herodotus (ix. 106) that the Lesbians were received into the alliance immediately after the battle of Mycale. Diodorus goes further and asserts that the 'Aeolians, meaning no doubt the cities of the mainland, were admitted at that time (xi. 37, τοὺς μὲν Ἴωνας καὶ τοὺς Αἰολεῖς συμμάχους ἐποιήσαντο). This, says Kirchhoff, is only the 'local-patriotismus' of the author,

NO. XXVIII. VOL. III.

whom Diodorus followed, Ephorus of Cyme, and the statement is 'in direct contradiction' to Herodotus.

There is no 'direct contradiction,' for Herodotus is absolutely silent about the Aeolians of the mainland. Kirchhoff himself admits that the possessions of Lesbos on the mainland would probably follow the lead of Lesbos ; and if so, why should the other cities hold back ? There is no certain proof that the Aeolians of the coast did not come into the alliance at this time, no good reason why they should not, and a slight presumption that they did.

b. The case of the Ionians of the mainland is different. Kirchhoff grounds his opinion on the fact that in his flight from Greece Themistocles could land at Ephesus. This in his judgment would have been impossible if Ephesus had been an allied town at the time. He has no positive proof stronger than this against the admission of the Ionian cities of the coast into the alliance before Eurymedon.

In answer we may observe : (1) that the proof only touches one city, and that the most Asiatic of Greek cities, the port at which the great inland route from Susa struck the sea ; (2) that the allies were busy at Naxos when Themistocles landed. On the other hand it is quite clear from the language of Herodotus and Thucydides that 'Ionia' really did come into the alliance at the time : οὕτω δὲ τὸ δεύτερον Ἴωνίη ἀπὸ Περσέων ἀπέσθη says the first, and in the second we read, οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀπ' Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου ἔγμματοι, ἤδη ἀφεστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλέως, ὑπομείναντες Σηστών ἐπολιόρκουν. Kirchhoff endeavours to avoid this contra-

c c

ix. 109.

i. 89.2

diction by assuming that 'Ionia' here means no more than the islands of the coast—in which sense he speaks of an 'Ionian district.' But this is not the common meaning of 'Ionia' and Ionians'; and the account which Herodotus gives of the proceedings after Mycale makes the assumption very improbable. As is well known the question was then raised whether the Greeks should undertake to protect the Ionians in their colonies, or transfer them to the ports of the Medizing cities in the peninsula of Greece. The Spartans wished to transfer them, but the Athenians undertook their defence and carried the day. Are we to suppose that in this discussion it is only the islanders who are meant; only those who were cut off from Asia by sea, at a time when Xerxes had hardly a ship in the Aegean? The cities most in need of protection were Miletus and other cities of the coast which were exposed to the vengeance of the King.

2. Thucydides very plainly tells us (*l. c.*) that the Athenians were aided in besieging Sestos by the *allies from the Hellespont*. Kirchhoff asserts that these could not be members of the Hellenic alliance because, after the departure of the Peloponnesians, the Athenians had no power to receive them. For this assertion he has no authority. The language of Thucydides (*ὑπομεινάντες*) implies (rather than not) that the Hellespontians were allies before the departure of the Spartans; and, if this were not the case, the Athenians, when they had carried the day about the admission of the Ionians, were probably in a position to admit new members, or thought that they were. (The synod at the Isthmus had ceased to act; the idea that their consent was necessary to the enrolment of allies is preposterous.) Besides in the account of Herodotus, at any rate, Leotychidas sails as far north as the Hellespont, though he takes no part in the siege of Sestos.

3. The attempt to prove that the Delian league was divided into districts from the first has been dealt with by Beloch in *Rheinisches Museum*, xliii. p. 104 ff.

Kirchhoff is in reality reduced to this position: he assumes that an Ionian, an island, and a Hellespontian district were formed at a very early time in the League, not simultaneously but in rapid succession; and that the Ionian district, though distinct from the island district, was entirely composed of islands. For proof he relies on these facts: the little island of Nisyros near Rhodes, which has nothing to do with Ionia, is classed (in

inscriptions after 442) with Ionia, not in the island district. This arrangement, says Kirchhoff, can only be explained by the supposition that Nisyros came over very early, at the same time as Samos, Chios etc., which, as he assumes, at the first formed the Ionian district. But such an argument requires that Euboea, Naxos, and Delos, which were members of the Hellenic confederacy before the Athenians formed a separate confederacy at all, should be classed with Samos and Chios. As a matter of fact they are not, but they formed part of the island district, and therefore, so far as chronology goes, Nisyros could have been placed in either group. Again, Lemnos and Imbros are put among the islands, not in the Hellespontian district, because, says Kirchhoff, the island district was formed before the Hellespontian. This view of course assumes that the Hellespontians were not allies from the first. Yet, as we have seen, the Hellespontians were received immediately after Mycale, and it is difficult to conceive, impossible to prove, that Lemnos and Imbros were received earlier. The Hellespontians were certainly allies before the Athenians formed a separate league. We may also observe that Delos and Samos came into the alliance within a month of each other: both are Ionian islands, yet each is in a different district. The classification into districts then seems to have nothing to do with the date of the accession of the cities included in them. As a matter of fact we do not find these districts established till 442 B.C. What principles prevailed in the classification we are unable to say.

4. Thucydides tells us that the first tribute was 460 talents, and later writers associate this assessment with the name of Aristides who, as we also learn from Thucydides, did fix a scale of tribute. (Thucydides does not precisely say that Aristides fixed the tribute at 460 talents, but that Aristides fixed a scale of tribute, and that the first tribute was assessed at 460 talents; later writers say definitely that the tribute was fixed by Aristides at 460 talents, and this on the face of it is what Thucydides means, though Kirchhoff denies it, and attempts to show that the text of Thucydides is faulty.) Kirchhoff asserts that such a sum is far in excess of any tribute paid before Eurymedon; even if we allow that all the cities which paid in the Peloponnesian war (*i.e.* in the island, Hellespontian, Ionian, exclusive of the cities in the mainland, and Thracian districts) paid from the first, and take the highest payments recorded in the inscriptions between 454 and 425 B.C., we do not get such a

sum. The largest amount which can have been collected from the states included in Kirchhoff's list before Eurymedon is 354 talents; later accessions brought it up to 512 talents, as assessed.

It would be more satisfactory if Kirchhoff had made it clearer how he arrives at the sum of 354 talents, and in any case, if we do not accept his conclusions about the Ionian cities of the coast, his reckoning must be altered. But without going into this we may observe: (1) that the inscriptions from which we derive our knowledge of the payments of the allies do not begin till 454, eleven years after Eurymedon, and (2) that the first *assessed* *φάρος* of which Thucydides speaks may have included not only the sums paid in money, but also the value of the ships provided by those allies who sent ships and not money. The use of such an assessment would be to provide an equitable scheme for commuting service in ships into payment of money, in order that those who did not wish to send ships could pay on a fixed scale. If this is the meaning of Thucydides, the amount is certainly not too large. Four hundred and sixty talents would about pay for a fleet of sixty ships during eight months of the year (which is what Pericles is said to have put upon the water), or of one hundred and twenty ships during four, or of eighty during six months.

5. The theory of the double conquest of Byzantium and Sestos rests mainly on the story quoted by Plutarch from Ion of Chios. Ion when a young man at Athens had heard Cimon give an account of his division of the spoil from Sestos and Byzantium. Now Sestos was taken in 478 by Xanthippus and Byzantium in the same year (probably) by Pausanias; how then could Cimon have anything to do with the spoil? Moreover Thucydides says of Pausanias after his return to Byzantium that he was driven out—*βία ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐκπολιορκηθεὶς*, and Plutarch confirms this: *οἱ σύμμαχοι μετὰ τοῦ Κίμωνος ἐξεπολιόρκησαν αὐτόν*. This then, says Kirchhoff, was the siege of Byzantium from which came the spoil in Ion's story; and as Sestos is mentioned in the same breath it must have been captured about the same time.

We are to believe then that Pausanias, of whom Thucydides tells us that he returned to the Hellespont in a single Hermionean vessel, as a private person wishing to take part in the war against Persia, resumed his position as commander of Byzantium, and that by some means he established himself there with a Persian garrison in spite of the presence of a large Athenian force. Here

he remained for some years and meanwhile even Sestos fell back into Persian hands. Then Cimon succeeded in reconquering both.

This account is at variance with Thucydides, who certainly does not convey the impression that Pausanias was in supreme authority on his return to Byzantium. The only words which Kirchhoff can quote on his side are those given above, *ἐκπολιορκηθεὶς βία*, and they seem to mean no more than that Pausanias, though a Spartan and an ally, was forcibly expelled and shut out from the city as an enemy. Plutarch's expression is nearly identical with that of Thucydides; but he substitutes Cimon and the allies for the Athenians. But Plutarch (1) confounds the first and second residence of Pausanias at Byzantium, a blunder which he could have avoided by consulting Thucydides; and (2) puts the story of Ion later than Eurymedon. And neither Thucydides nor Plutarch speaks of any garrison with Pausanias. Moreover Kirchhoff's theory requires that Byzantium was held for Pausanias during his absence at Sparta. By whom was it held? The Persian garrison had been taken captive and sent away. When Doreis was sent out immediately after the recall of Pausanias, the Athenians and allies were in possession of the place and refused to receive him. How did Pausanias get rid of them? We may allow that he was supplied with money from Persia, and backed by Persian influence. He may have established a party in the place, so that force was needed to turn him out. But this is quite a different thing from being practically tyrant of the city and master of forces to hold it.

The whole theory of the second siege really rests on the flimsy foundation of Ion's story. And with respect to this we observe that Ion merely says that the allies brought many captives to Cimon from Byzantium and Sestos, to be divided between them and the Athenians. Now Cimon was no doubt present at both sieges in 478, and that might serve for the foundation of the story. It is not certain, indeed it is very improbable, that we have the story in a genuine form before us. The Ion may be a Pseudo-Ion; or Plutarch may quote inaccurately. As it is told, the story is too silly to be credible. Were the allies so ignorant of the value of slaves and of ransom that they took clothes before men? Had not Artayctes quite recently offered large sums of money for his own life and his son's? Against the theory built on such a substructure we have the silence of Thucydides who, while

dwelling at unusual length on the fortunes of Pausanias and speaking of his intrigues with Persia, says nothing of his second rule in Byzantium.

For these reasons I think that we are very much where we were in regard to the earlier history of the Delian League. Hero-

dotus and Thucydides are our only sure guides. We contradict them at our peril; and 'combinations' which involve such contradictions require much stronger proof in their favour than they are ever likely to receive.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

GRAMMATICAL GENDER.¹

THE phenomena of grammatical gender belong still to the profoundest mysteries of language. The questionings that arise in the mind of every English-speaking school-boy when he first hears that *mensa* is 'feminine' and *ager* is 'masculine' remain practically unanswered for all his teachers. The German boy who has grown up in the mystery of a 'masculine' *Kopf* and a 'feminine' *Hand* is less liable to ask questions, and is more tolerant of the grammar's dogmatism, but the mystery is only transferred, not explained.

The plain difficulty lies just here. What is meant by the assertion that mere words possess characteristics of sex? What fine-fibred quality inheres in the word *urbs* and the word *fortitudo* that can establish them a claim to femininity, or what is peculiarly masculine in the sound of *ager*? But does not the notion of sex attach rather to the thing denoted by the word than to the word itself? Certainly the names of objects having natural gender usually follow that gender; thus, *la femme* is a commoner case than *das Weib*. We know furthermore that in many cases words of kindred signification are associated together in point of grammatical gender; thus, a group of feminine words for road, path, etc., is formed within the recorded history of the Greek language, so of names for trees in the Latin. It is not however because roads are thought of as possessing feminine characteristics that *κέλευθος* is made feminine with *ὁδός*, but solely because the likeness of signification induces an association of the word forms.

In all of the Indo-European languages, so

¹ Heinrich Winckler. *Weiteres zur Sprachgeschichte. Das Grammatische Geschlecht. Formlose Sprachen. Entgegnung.* Pp. 206. Berlin 1889. Ferd. Dummler's Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Karl Brugmann. *Das Nominalgeschlecht in den Indogermanischen Sprachen.* Techmer's *Internationale Zeitschrift der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft.* Vol. ix. pp. 100-109.

far back as their history is known to us, gender is *grammatical*, i.e. attaches solely to the word-form. This is attested by a great variety of facts, as well as in the consciousness of speakers of living languages. Foxes of both natural genders were among the Greeks called by a name that was grammatically feminine, mice by a masculine name. When the German uses the article *die* in *die Maus*, he does so because it is demanded by the name *Maus*, not by the object denoted thereby.

An examination of the linguistic consciousness of those who speak languages in which grammatical gender is widely applied shows furthermore that the speaker does not in any wise associate the characteristics of sex with the word-forms to which he applies grammatical gender; e.g. to the German folk-consciousness there is nothing woman-like or cow-like in the form and sound of the word *Hand*. The terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' therefore, inasmuch as they apply in their real meaning neither to the denoted objects nor to the denoting names, are to be regarded solely as meaningless symbols serving the convenience of grammatical science. That the two independent systems of descriptive grammar, the Hindoo and the Greek, upon which all the current systems of the world base, should have adopted these terms to mark and denote certain mysterious categories of grammar is undoubtedly due to the approximate correspondence of these classifications of words to the classifications of natural sex; i.e. the relation of the word *θύρα* to the word *λόγος* was described in terms of the relation of the objects denoted by the words *θεός* and *θεά*.

We come now to the question, which is fundamental in all consideration of the subject: viz. Is this approximate correspondence of the gender-classifications to the sex-classifications original or only secondary? That is to say, does grammatical gender have its

origin historically in natural gender, or is the association of natural gender with the variety of word-form (e.g. -os, -ā, -om) entirely secondary? The older and, we may say, orthodox view is that which finds in the classifications of gender a reflection of the earliest products of primitive imagination which, as Friedrich Pott says in his treatise on Grammatical gender (Ersch. u. Gruber's *Encycl.*), 'fancies all around and in itself to be alive, and so personifies everything, and in consequence thereof sexualizes everything.'

In the first place we are inclined to doubt Pott's confident assumption that sexualization is a necessary consequence of personification. We do not believe that, even to the mind of the primitive man, the classification of objects in the world of animate life according to sex was of such all eclipsing importance that the whole world of inanimate life should be made to submit to it.

We certainly cannot hold the personification theory as Pott held it. If we are to find the beginnings of grammatical gender in the attribution of natural gender, we must think of these beginnings as limited to a comparatively small number of words, which afterwards, when the signs of gender had become formal or symbolic rather than presentative, associated with themselves other words on the principles of formal analogy. This process must be thought of as taking place far back in the history of the parent speech.

Diametrically opposed to the current view as represented by Pott is the view presented recently by Brugmann in the fourth volume of Techmer's *Zeitschrift* in his article on 'Das Nominalgeschlecht in den Indogermanischen Sprachen.' That Winkler in his treatise on Grammatical Gender cited above takes no notice of Brugmann's article can be explained only on the supposition that he had not read it. If he had not accepted its conclusions, he still would have been obliged to deal with its propositions, and the cool historical sense which pervades the work of Brugmann might have availed to dispel some of the mystical notions about this phase of language-life which pervert Winkler's entire treatment of the subject.

Winkler belongs to that school of philologists—we may call them the 'Humboldtianer'—who interest themselves in discussing the *features* of language to the almost total neglect of the *life* of language. This is chiefly traceable to the fact that their studies are so largely limited to language without a history. It is however

impossible to characterize a language without at least some consideration of its principles of growth.

Brugmann in the article cited takes the extreme view, that the classifications of grammatical 'gender' as we now call it antedated, in the history of the Indo-European parent speech, all classification according to natural sex. The suffix *ā*, to illustrate, was shared by a large number of nouns. It involved no implication of gender. The question of its original purpose and signification is left, for the time being, out of account. The fact, however, that some much-used words like **gyn-ā* (γυνή) and **māmā* contained -*ā* caused it to be utilized by the linguistic consciousness as a sign of sex, and to be applied in the creation of new words like **equā* beside **equos*. This group of sex-words is therefore, according to Brugmann, an interloper among the *ā*-words—*φρόν*, *στροφά*, *τιμή*, etc., which have no original connection with any ideas of sex.

The recently published discoveries of Johannes Schmidt in his *Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra* lend, unwittingly we may presume, a certain support to this view so far as the *ā* suffix is concerned. He shows that the *ā* of the neuter plural and the *ā* of the feminine singular first declension are one and the same original element, and had originally a collective signification from which the abstract signification was easily derived. In this way he explains, for instance, the use in Greek of a singular verb with a neuter plural subject.

The question approached by Brugmann cannot however be settled from a consideration of the phenomena of the Indo-European languages alone. The classification according to gender is in one form or another characteristic of various families of speech. Few, in fact, are entirely lacking in some classification like it or analogous to it. Furthermore, the processes concerned take place prior to the separation of the different branches of the Indo-European languages, and hence cannot be studied by the ordinary methods of comparison. In such 'glottogenic' questions it is essential to gain assistance from the other fields of linguistic experience. Here it is that such treatises as that of Winkler and of L. Adam *Du Genre* come to our help.

The real import of the classification according to gender as it appears in the Indo-European, the Semitic, the North-Caucasian, and various African languages, as well as the impulse toward the same—these scholars undertake to illustrate from

a variety of analogous and apparently equally superfluous classifications in other less 'highly-developed' languages. Such, for example, are the classifications which distinguish between objects as animate and inanimate, rational and irrational, of high rank and of low, present or near and absent or at a distance. Thus the Iroquois languages place objects of female sex in a class with inanimate objects and inferior animate objects over against a class composed of males and supernatural beings. This tendency to discriminate in the outward form of language between the animate and the inanimate is a feature of many languages, for instance of certain of the modern Slavonic idioms. Winkler (pp. 15 f., 87) ventures to find the earliest impulse to the Indo-European distinction between masculine and feminine in a classification of superior as contrasted with inferior or weaker objects.

We know from the recent theorizing upon the origin and development of the family-system how suggestive and yet how unsafe are all attempts to explain the prehistoric development of the forms of civilized life by interposing as grades and sub-grades of development various selected forms from disconnected types of existing barbarous and savage life; and yet the suggestiveness of Winkler's discussion cannot be denied. It certainly convinces us that Brugmann was much too hasty in his generalizations in the article alluded to, and that within limits—limits perhaps narrower than those drawn in the historic period of language—grammatical gender is in its origin really gender.

Still the work of Winkler is full of the most fanciful generalizations and hazy with mystical notions of the nature of speech.

When he, for instance, on p. 87 tells us that the 'motions-elemente *i, a (ia)*' which appear to denote the feminine in a wide diversity of linguistic territories like the Indo-European, Semitic, Hamitic, North-Caucasian, Mantchu, Singhalese, etc. evidently have in all the common symbolic value of the finer or weaker, he is taking the *φύσει*-side of the Platonic discussion after a manner which no one now-a-days can follow who has any sense for the real life and nature of language.

This much is clear from the discussion. Language is not satisfied merely to mark or denote the object of reference. It often goes further, and adds—what is generally entirely unnecessary to the denotation of the object—an implication of some sort concerning the *nature* of the object, concerning its superiority or inferiority, its nearness or remoteness, its animateness or inanimateness, or concerning its sex.

What however is superfluous or relatively so for the noun, in that the mention of the name without further implication regarding nature, character, etc. suffices to indicate what object is meant, may not be superfluous for the pronoun (*he, she, it*). May not the inflections of the pronoun have had a determining influence upon the development of grammatical gender in the noun? We know that within the separate life of the Indo-European languages the inflection of the pronoun exercised a large influence upon that of the noun (cf. *θεός*, Oscan *egna-zum*, Skr. *tā-sām*). Still there are questions which cannot be settled or even fairly discussed from the point of view of any single body of languages.

BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER.

Ithaca, N. Y.

ON THE MSS. OF ORIGENES *C. CELSUM*.

A PECULIAR interest belongs to this treatise. It is the last work of a great thinker: it is an elaborate reply to the earliest literary assault upon our religion, and it reproduces in the form of direct quotation a large portion of the assailant's writing. The text is preserved partly in manuscripts containing the treatise, partly in the more numerous MSS. of the *Philocalia*, a collection of extracts from Origen's works (particularly the *contra Celsum*) made by Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus towards the close of the fourth century. The *c. Cel-*

sum was edited in 1605 by David Hoeschel and again by De la Rue in 1733: other editors have merely reproduced the work of their predecessors. Hoeschel, as will be seen from the following list of MSS. worked from three, of a late date, and all belonging, as will be shown, to one only of the two principal groups. De la Rue knew as many as eight, but his collations are frequently inaccurate, and he appears to have known nothing of the history of the text or of the mutual relations of the MSS. he used.

During the last few months two mono-

graphs on the texts of the *Philocalia* and the *c. Celsum* have appeared—one by my fellow-worker the Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, Fellow of Christ's College, in vol. xviii. of the *Journal of Philology*, the other in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. vi. by Dr. Paul Koetschau, Gymnasiallehrer in Jena. Of Mr. Robinson's work on the *Philocalia* I hope to give an account on a future occasion. The last six pages only of his paper are occupied with the *c. Celsum*. Without entering fully into detail, he gives his conclusions clearly and succinctly. Dr. Koetschau, on the other hand, has written at much greater length, describing with a dramatic vividness which possesses the greatest charm for those who have travelled over the same ground, the

successive steps of his investigation. It is impossible to speak too highly of the accuracy of his collations or of the shrewdness of his inferences. Both writers agree entirely in their main conclusions, and these may be relied on with the greater security when it is remembered that they have worked independently of each other. I can do little more than give their results, reinforcing their arguments occasionally from my own collations. I may add that I have seen all the MSS. mentioned below, with the exception of *Vat.* 309, *Leyden* 17, *Munich* 64 and 517. For my knowledge of the last three I am indebted entirely to my friend the Rev. E. C. Selwyn, Master of Uppingham School, and formerly Fellow of King's College.

List of the MSS. of the 'c. Celsum.'

Basel	A. III. 9.	Century.	
Leyden	17	xvi.	<i>Basiliensis</i> [De la Rue].
Milan	117	xvi.	
"	119	} (Book I. and part of Book II.) }	xvi.
"	121a		
"	121b		
Munich	64	xvi.	<i>Boicus</i> [Hoeschel].
"	517	xvi.	<i>Augustanus</i> [Hoeschel].
Oxford	E. I. 7	xv.	<i>Anglicanus</i> i. [De la Rue].
"	146	xvi.	<i>Anglicanus</i> ii. [De la Rue].
"	E. 2.8 (Bk. I. and part of II.)	xvi.	<i>Anglicanus</i> iii. [De la Rue].
Paris	616	xiv.	
"	945	xiv.	<i>Regius</i> [De la Rue].
"	293	xvi.	<i>Jolianus</i> [De la Rue].
Rome	386	xiii.	<i>Vaticanus</i> i. [De la Rue].
"	387	xv. or xvi.	<i>Vaticanus</i> ii. [De la Rue].
"	309	xvi.	<i>Palatinus</i> [Hoeschel].
"	35 (Part of Bk. I.)	xvi.	
"	75 (Part of Bk. I.)	xvi.	
Venice	45	xiv.	
"	44	xiv.	
"	46	xv.	

Three others are mentioned in Catalogues—one at Madrid, written in 1555 by George Tryphon (who we know was in Venice 1548), another in Constantinople, and a third at Rodosto, but of these nothing is known.

From *Vat.* 386 and *Paris* 616 all the rest as we shall see have been derived.

The oldest MS. we possess is—

(I.) *Rome* (*Vat. Lib.*) 386.

The volume contains (a) the Panegyric on Origen by Gregory Thaumaturgus, (b) the treatise *c. Celsum*, the first five books of which are written by the transcriber of the Panegyric, the remainder by a contemporary

scribe, (c) by a third hand, an extract from Galen.

The Panegyric and the *c. Celsum* are written on cotton paper, and belong probably to the end of the thirteenth century. Huge heads or tails are given to several letters according as they occur in the first or last lines of the page. Iota inscript is occasionally found as in $\tau\circ\circ$; very rarely Iota adscript or subscript. The old form of *beta* (*u*) is regularly used. Corrections and annotations by each scribe are placed in the margin.

At the end of Book I. we have the following note:— $\pi\rho\acute{o}s\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$

ἀληθῇ λόγον ὀριγένοῦς τόμος α̃:—μετεβλήθη καὶ ἀντεβλήθη ἐξ ἀντιγράφων τῶν αὐτοῦ ὀριγένοῦς βιβλίων. After Book II. we read: πρὸς τὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένον κέλσου ἀληθῇ λόγον, τόμος β̃. Similar notes are appended to Books III. and V.

The MS. has suffered in the binding; the bottom margin has been cut away from several pages in Bk. III. There is reason to believe that it has been twice in the binder's hands.

(i.) On the first occasion two quaternions in Bk. V. were transposed and the pages were numbered according to this faulty arrangement, which remains to this day. We are warned of the error by a note on p. 124 (which should have been numbered p. 128), *ζῆται ἔμπροσθεν μετὰ φύλλα δ̃*, and at the end of p. 131 (properly p. 127), *ζῆται ὀπισθεν πρὸ φύλλον η̃*. [I am indebted to Dr. Koetschau for this information]. Again, under the impression that a leaf was missing after No. 100, the binder has interposed a blank sheet, which he numbers 101, before the following page: his impression however is erroneous, as p. 102a begins with *τινὰ γέγραπται*, the natural conclusion of *ἀπὸ τοῦ Τιμαίου*, which are the last words on p. 100b. [Lommatsch's edition of the *c. Celsum*, vol. ii. p. 84, l. 18].

Before the second binding another event occurred in the history of this MS. We shall see immediately that the following words must once have stood in the text of Book I. c. 32 (L. i. 65, 18 to 66. 1).

ἀναγέγραπται ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μήτηρ κύνουσα ὡς ἐξωθέισα ὑπὸ τοῦ μνηστευσάμενου αὐτὴν τέκτονος ἐλεγχθείσα ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ καὶ τίκτουσα ἀπὸ τίνος στρατιώτου πανθήρα (or -ος) τοῦνομα· καὶ ἰδωμεν εἴ μὴ τυφλῶς οἱ μυθοποιήσαντες τὴν μοιχείαν τῆς παρθένου καὶ τοῦ πανθήρα (or -ος), κ.τ.λ.

The spaced words were now erased, doubtless from motives of reverence, and have not been re-written.

(ii.) At the second binding a leaf numbered 42, containing part of Bk. II. from *λόγους αὐτοῦ* (Lomm. i. 160. 6) to *ἀπὸ τοῦ σώ* (L. i. 165. 7) really had been lost, and its place was supplied by a blank sheet.

This MS. has three direct descendants, (A) *Ven.* 45, (B) *Ven.* 44, (C) the lost fragment from which *Milan* 121a was copied. The first of these was written after the former binding, when the quaternions were displaced, but before the erasure; the second after the erasure; the third after leaf 42 had disappeared.

A little later than the date of (B) *Ven.* 44 a translation of the *c. Celsum* was published

by Christophorus Persona, who is described in a note at the end of the book as 'prior sanctae Balbinae de urbe [sc. Roma] latine graeceque peritissimus.' The translation was printed for him at Rome by George Herolt of Bamberg, in January, 1481. De la Rue tells us that Persona had composed a dedicatory letter to Pope Sixtus IV. which he subsequently discarded, finding his Holiness less munificent than he had hoped. In the copy of the book in the Cambridge University Library the title-page is wanting: the dedication is addressed to the Doge Giovanni Mocenigo 'universoque senatui inclito consultissimoque,' and is preceded by a letter to the translator from Theodore of Gaza, a friend of Sixtus's predecessor, Nicolas V. From this letter we learn that the latter Pope, who was the founder of the Vatican Library, had had purchased for him this MS. (*Vat.* 386) in Constantinople. As he died in 1455 it must have found its way to Italy before that date.

We can trace its history a little further back. On the first page we read *θεοδώρου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ*, apparently the name of its owner. This Theodore was a monk, first at Mount Sinai, and afterwards at Batopedium, on Mount Athos. He died at the latter monastery, 28th Sept. 1457. (See Fabricius x. p. 375, ed. 174). So it was probably from him that the MS. was bought by Pope Nicolas.

We pass now to the two MSS. at Venice, which were brought thither by the famous Bessarion after he turned his back on the East at the Council of Florence in 1439, when he received the cardinal's hat. They probably came to Venice in 1468, in one of the forty-eight chests containing the collection which he had been accumulating since his boyhood, and now presented to the Republic.

A. *Venice* (*St. Mark's Lib.*) 45.

This is a paper MS. of the fourteenth century. Just as in *Vat.* 386, the *c. Celsum* is preceded by Gregory's Panegyric: it is followed by some extracts from Eus. H. E. V. 22.

We learn from a note on p. 6 that this MS. belonged to Bessarion, who is here designated Cardinal of Tusculum.

Two correctors, I think, have been at work. Occasionally their alterations have been made in the margin, but very often the old writing has been washed out, and the correction substituted in its place. The variations of this MS. are so very numerous that I was inclined, with Mr. Robinson, to trace it to some unknown original other than

Vat. 386. But Dr. Koetschau has shown conclusively that it is derived from the latter MS., seeing that the displaced quaternions referred to above are copied in their wrong order. The Venetian corrector has detected the error, and does his best to rectify it by marginal notes, but these notes are worded differently from those of the Vatican correction, which must clearly be of a later date than the MS. before us. Celsus's blasphemies concerning our Lord's birth had not yet been erased, as they are transcribed in full.

The notes following Books I., II., III. V. are not given. The scribe has left spaces for them, as also for the initial letters of the books, intending, no doubt to fill them in with red ink.

The corrections I believe to be entirely conjectural: in the extremely rare cases where they agree with the readings of another independent MS. the coincidence is purely accidental. Here are some specimens of the changes made in the MS. before us (the motive is in most cases easily seen), which serve to identify copies from it.

Om. βουλομένη (Lomm. I. 19. 1, so in *Paris* 945): ἐκείνων for ἐτέρων (20. 14): τυράννον (20. 16) δέ τι for δ' ἐτι (21. 15, so also *Paris* 616), om. ὡς after δυνάμεως (correction 21. 19) λέγω for λέγει δέ (corr. 27. 1), σπεύδων for πιστεύων, and in margin ἐλπίζων ἢ πιστεύων (32. 5), δυσσεδαμονίας (36. 18: so in 138. 5); οἰκείας for εἰκαίαις (corr. 97. 14, an unfamiliar word; so also *Paris* 616); ἀποκτείναι for ἀπόλεσαι (123. 18) λάον for λόγον (247. 7); πειρασμοὶ for περισπασμοὶ (III. 1. 14) σκοτοφαγεῖν (19. 9). Several examples of error due to homoeoteleuton, e.g. Lomm. I. 247. 12 [om. from λόγον to λόγον] 265 [om. from ἰατρικῇ, l. 15 to the same word l. 18], III. 36, 15-18; 46, 7; 67. 20-68. 1; 79, 16-18; 138, 5-8. On the other hand, in III. 8, 19, after αὐτοῦ the words κατόρθωσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων are repeated from line 14.

To *Ven.* 45 we trace with absolute certainty no less than eight MSS. which it is unnecessary to describe in detail.

(a). *Venice* (*St. Mark's Libr.*) 46.

Parchment, cent. xv. Beautifully written and ornamented. This also belonged to Bessarion's Library; it contains his coat of arms, and was probably transcribed by his orders. It is a faithful copy of its original, incorporating into the text all its marginal notes, and varying from it only where it is illegible.

From *Ven.* 46 is copied:

(a₁). *Paris* (*Bib. Nat.*) *Suppl. Gr.* 293.

Paper, cent. xvi. Referred to frequently

by De la Rue as *Codex Jolianus*, so-called from Claude Joly, one of its possessors, from whom it passed to the Library of Notre Dame; in the eighteenth century the Canons presented it, together with twelve other MSS., to Louis XVI. Conjectural emendations are suggested in the margin, as also readings from *Ven.* 44, and occasionally from a *Philocalia* MS.

(b). *Rome* (*Vat. Lib.*) No. 387 of the *Ottomanian Collection*.

Partly paper, partly parchment, cent. xv. or xvi. Like *Ven.* 45 it leaves blank spaces where we should expect headings or subscriptions to the books, and omits the initial letter before each book but the first, where the letter, wanting in that MS., has been beautifully painted. Unlike *Ven.* 46, it does not adopt into the text the conjectures of its archetype, but leaves them in the margin. It is frequently inaccurate.

This MS. has been most carelessly copied by:—

(b₁) *Rome* (*Vat. Lib.*) No. 35 of the *Ottomanian Collection* (cent. xvi.).

(b₂) *Rome* (*Vat. Lib.*) No. 75 of the *Ottomanian Collection* (cent. xvi.).

It is impossible to decide from the appearance of these MSS. whether they were ever complete. At present No. 35 ends φησί δέ τινες μή δέ βου (L. i. 28. 5), but the λομένους below may perhaps show that at least one page followed. The last words of No. 75 are ὡς ἐξ ἴσου (L. i. 33. 10).

Both repeat the errors of *Vat.* 387, e.g. βίου for λόγον (L. i. 22. 3), ἐν added after παρέμεινεν (ib. 12) τῶν omitted (ib. 19) ἀκούει for ἀκούειν (27. 1): and abound in errors of their own.

(c). *Leyden* (*Bibl. Publ.*) 17.

Paper, cent. xvi. Carelessly written. Resembles *Vat.* 387, but is not taken from it. Hence

(c₁). *Munich* 64.

Paper, cent. xvi. This is Hoeschel's *Codex Boicus*. Written by Andreas Darmarius (of whom Gardthausen writes: 'ita scelestus erat Andreas Darmarius Epirota ut nihil illi credere debeamus nec titulis eius'). I have no doubt that this is a copy of the *Leyden* MS. The same strange spellings occur in both, e.g. ἱπιστεύθη for ἐπιστεύθη, ἔρει for ὄρει, but the very numerous omissions in the latter have been supplied (appy. *prima manu*) in the margin from *Ven.* 45 or one of its descendants; no other change appears to have been made. From this again is copied:

(c₁ a). *Munich* 517 (formerly in Augsburg Library).

Paper, cent. xvi. The quaternions are quite loose, though they are pierced for thread, and were probably once bound. From marginal notes for the printer we learn that it was from this MS. that Hoeschel's edition was printed.

(B) *Venice (St. Mark's Libr.) 44.*

Written on paper (cent. xiv.). There is a note on the fly-leaf—*κτῆμα βησσαρίωνος καρδινάλεως νικαίας τοῦ τῶν σαβίνων*. The *c. Celsum* is preceded by Gregory's Panegyric as in *Vat.* 386, and the notes which there follow Books I., II., III., V., are repeated here. The words erased in I. c. 32 are omitted, but no gap is left in the text. On the other hand the contents of the lost leaf (42) of the Vatican MS. are given, and the two quaternions of Book III. occur in their proper order; obviously the note referring to their displacement had been made when this MS. was written. The scribe, however, is slightly puzzled by the phenomenon, as we see by his paging. Folio 138 is followed by 130, after which the numbers follow consecutively. [Folios 151–158 have been inserted upside down in the reverse order].

The derivation of *Ven.* 44 from *Vat.* 386 is evident. Curious spellings are copied (e.g. ἀπαξαπλῶς, L. i. 37. 10); in L. i. 38. 26 the words λέγειν...σόφοις, forming exactly a line in the *Vat.* MS., are omitted: the scribe's eye wanders from *δηγούμενοι*, i. 139. 12 to the same word repeated immediately below, and he omits all the intervening words; in i. 232. 7 he omits ἡ δὲ τὰς δυνάμεις, the last four words in a line of his original. These omissions are supplied by a corrector in the margin. Dr. Koetschau points out two gaps in the MS. (Book V.) corresponding to two holes which have been made in *Vat.* 386 since *Ven.* 45 was copied from it.

There are a few variations, apparently due in most cases to the negligence of the scribe. Thus he omits the note opposite the end of I. c. 8 (ὅτι δύο οἱ κέλσος); for *περιπατητικός* (L. i. 30. 19) he writes *περιπατηκός*; in L. i. 146. 3 a corrector alters *μὴ* to *μὴν*, and in line 13 of the same page he writes *οἱ* for *εἰ*, and gives the words that follow in the following order: *πιστοὶ ἔσμεν λέγοντες καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐωράκαμεν*; in p. 266. 10 *διασάσεις* for *διὰ στάσεις*. In i. 124. 13 the corrector has apparently erased τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν Ἡρώδου, and written τὴν ὁρμὴν Ἡρώδου. In iii. 15. 6 ἀπογραφάμενοι is written twice over. In Book II. several lines are omitted from ἀρῶν (L. i. 171. 8) to εἰμαρται (172. 11).

Ven. 44 is the original of

(a). *Rome (Vat. Lib.) 309 of the Palatine Collection.*

Paper. As in *Ven.* 44, Gregory's Panegyric precedes the *c. Celsum*, and we have after Book I. the note which is characteristic of this group: *μετεβλήθη καὶ ἀντεβλήθη, κ.τ.λ.* At the end of the last book, *δόξα σοι ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι. ἀφμε* (sc. 1545) *ἱανουαρίου κδ† ἐτελείσθη τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐκ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ ἰω(άνν) ου μανρομάτη.* John Mauromates wrote at Venice, whither, as we have seen, *Ven.* 44 was brought in the previous century.

(b). *Oxford (New Coll.) 146.*

Paper, cent. xvi. Presented to the College by Cardinal Pole (then Archbishop of Canterbury) in 1557. There appear to be at least three correctors (i.) the original scribe or a contemporary; (ii.) a scribe who wrote shortly after; his corrections, like those of (i.) are purely conjectural, e.g. *ἐπενούοντο* for *ἐποιούοντο* (L. i. 20. 10) *τυγχάνουσι* (25. 16), except where they are taken from the *Philocalia*; (iii.) a later writer, who regularly gives *Philocalia* readings in the margin, distinguishing them by a peculiar symbol (Λ). This MS., following *Ven.* 44, omits Lomm. i. 171. 8 to 172. 11. Corrector (ii.) adds 'λείπει πολλά, vide an ex philocalia suppleri possit,' &c.

(b). *Oxford (Bod. Libr.) E. 2. 8.*

Paper, cent. xvi. Defective; the last page ends with *ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν* (II. c. 2; Lomm. i. 138. 5), the *αὐτὸν* being written after the scribe's manner at the bottom of the page, and at right angles to the preceding words, in order to mark that it is also the first word of the page following. By the kindness of the Librarian of New College I was enabled to compare the MS. belonging to that college with E. 2. 8, and satisfied myself that the writer of the latter was the second corrector of the former. His corrections are embodied in the MS. before us, which is a very faithful copy of *New Coll.* 146.

One MS. remains to be described, which cannot be traced to either *Ven.* 44 or *Ven.* 45 alone, but is derived from both. This is:

Oxford (Bodl. Libr.) E. 17.

A paper MS. of the fifteenth century, written throughout by the same hand. In the middle of Book III. a large omission has been made—from *γενέσθαι* to *ὁρῶν* ἀπ' ἐ[L. i. 286. 7–14]. A page containing the omitted words has been intercalated by a late corrector. The earlier part of the treatise, probably to the end of Book V., has been transcribed from *Ven.* 44. The peculiar readings of that MS. which have been described above are repeated, including its corrections, e.g. in Lomm. i. 124. 13 and i. 146. 3. Even the mis-spelling *περι-*

πατήρ (i. 30. 19) recurs. In Book II. there is the same long omission (i. 171. 8 to 172. 11). In Book V. the two gaps of *Ven.* 44 are reproduced; the second has been filled by a later hand. At the end of Book I. we have the familiar *μετεβλήθη* καὶ *ἀντεβλήθη*. The *Panthera* blasphemies are, of course, wanting, but these have been supplied by a corrector of the sixteenth century, who has added numerous readings from *Ven.* 45 or one of its descendants. After Book V. the original scribe has ceased to follow *Ven.* 44—perhaps he was disturbed by the gaps above-mentioned in that book—and copies *Ven.* 45. Proofs are numerous; it may suffice to point out that *σκοτοφαγεῖν* is read in iii. 19. 9, and *ὡς νεκρῷ* (55. 8); there is the same repetition of *κατόρθωσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (8. 19), and the same errors of homocoteleuton, e.g. 19. 24-20. 1, 36. 15-18.

Opposite Book IV. c. 184 we have an annotation in red (σὴ ὅτι διαβάλλεται ὁ ὠριγένης ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ εἰς τὴν μετεμνήχουσιν. Similar annotations are common in the latter part of the book. One of these is taken directly or indirectly from *Vat.* 386, as according to Dr. Koetschau it is found in no other MS.¹ This note is given in Lomm. II. p. 186, n. 1, *μὴ λέγε διάκονον. κ.τ.λ.* [The scribe writes, in place of *διάκονος* in the next line, *διακονή*, but such silly blunders in spelling are common in this MS. At the close is a note: *constitut pro descriptione et collatione fl.* (= florins) 23½, which seems to show that it was copied in the west; if so, it must have been very shortly after the arrival of the Venetian MSS.

(C). *Milan (Ambrosian Libr.)*. Nos. 117, 119, 121a, 121b. The latter two are bound together in one volume.

These belong to the sixteenth century, and are possibly written by the same hand. 121a appeared to me the original of the rest, which copy its marginal conjectures or silently incorporate them into their text. Like their original they contain only Book I. and part of Book II., ending abruptly at the words *ἀπιστῶν μὲν αὐτῷ* (ch. 13. l. i. p. 160, l. 4). A note is added in all four—ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιγράφου μᾶλλον δὲ, *πρωτοτύπου πρὸς τὸ παρὼν, φύλλον ἐνὸς ἐκκοπέντος, ἔλειπε τοσοῦτον, ὅσον, ἀρκούντως πληρῶσθαι τοῦ διὰ λιτάδιον, ἐξάγγελται πρωτοτύπου εἰ εὐρεθείη ἐκγραφησόμενον οὐ χάριν ἀφείθη λιτάδιον*. Below is written, as a correction of *ἐξάγγελται*, f. εἰ

ἐξάλλη που uel *ἐξ ἀνελλιποῦς*. We may conclude that MS. 121a cannot claim a higher place than third in the line of descent from that referred to as the *πρωτότυπον*. First must have come a copy containing this note in an intelligible form: then another into which *ἐξάγγελται*, with probably other corruptions,² was introduced, and somewhat later, two emendations of this word by a western hand (observe the Latin *f.* = fortasse, and *uel*); lastly our MS., in which the former of these emendations is wrongly transcribed. The *πρωτότυπον* is *Vat.* 386, where, as has been said, a page was lost at this place after the Venetian MSS. had been copied. It is true that in the preceding page the Roman scribe has written seventeen words after *ἀπιστῶν μὲν αὐτῷ*, but as five of them are given, not in the text but in the margin, and as the sentence stands unfinished, the transcriber of the original of the Milan MS. apparently thought it safer to copy no more. With the exception of some unimportant variations in spelling and a few transpositions of words, the texts of the two MSS. coincide. The former part of the Vatican note at the end of Book I. is repeated; not the latter (*μετεβλήθη καὶ ἀντεβλήθη, κ.τ.λ.*). The passage containing *Panthera's* name (see above) is, of course, wanting. Other omissions have been made, *reverentiae causa*, and there is a note stating that they exist also in τὸ *πρωτότυπον*.

This MS. contains some interesting notes of Gennadius, who became Patriarch of Constantinople shortly after the fall of the Eastern Empire. Opposite the first page of the preface (L. i. 12. 12) we read: *γενναδίου περὶ τοῦ ὠριγένους τούτου οἱ μὲν δυτικοὶ διδάσκαλοι λέγουσιν οὕτως. ὠριγένης (sic) ὅπου καλῶς εἶπεν, οὐδεὶς κάλλιον· καὶ ὅπου κακῶς, οὐδεὶς χείρον· οἱ δὲ ἡμέτεροι Ἀσιανοὶ, ποῦ μὲν ὠριγένης ἢ πάντων ἡμῶν ἀκόνῃ· ποῦ δὲ ὠριγένης ἢ τῶν θολερῶν δογματῶν πηγῇ, κ.τ.λ.* Again: *γενναδ' εἶθε ὠρίγενης, ὡς τὰ ἄλλα συνέστης τῇ τοῦ ἱὺ πίστεως καλῶς, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν θν' καὶ πρᾶ', κατ' οὐσίαν ἐνόητος αὐτοῦ ἐφρόνεις καλῶς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, κ.τ.λ.* As Gennadius—who assumed this name about 1448; he was previously known as George the Scholar—was a bitter enemy of the Latins after the Council of Florence, it is natural to conclude that these notes were made before *Vat.* 386 was carried to the West. And when we remember that Theodorus Sophianus, to whom that MS. belonged, was Gennadius's nephew, we are tempted to infer that they

¹ Dr. Koetschau speaks doubtfully of its presence in the Oxford MS., having no other authority than De la Rue's note, about the accuracy of which he is not unnaturally sceptical. I have seen it myself in the MS.

² E.g. *λιτάδιον*, or possibly *λυτάδιον*; the writing is uncertain. In either case I cannot trace the word; here it = gap or space.

were made in his monastery, perhaps by Genadius himself, when the Milan archetype was transcribed. On the other hand, the evidence supplied by Persona's translation shows that page 42, lost at the date of this archetype, was not missing when the MS. left the East.

We now pass to another MS. differing widely from all the preceding, the original of a much smaller group:

II. *Paris* (*Bib. Nat.*) *Suppl. Grec.* 616.

Parchment. Contains Gregory's *Panegyric*, the *c. Celsum*, and the *Ad Martyrium*. Written throughout by the same hand, which has written also the following note at the end: ἐτελειώθη μηνὶ δεκῇ ἰα' ᾠ' ἔτους σ'ωμῆ' χειρὶ λουκά μοναχοῦ τοῦ ἀθλίου καὶ ἐλεεινοῦ: ὁρισμῶ τοῦ—the remainder has been obliterated. The cause of this alteration is given in a note by a later hand: τὸ παρὸν ἐγράφη κατὰ τὸ σ'ωμῆ' ἔτος ἦτοι ατκή (probably, as Dr. Koetschau suggests, he meant to write ατμή = 1348) διὰ χειρὸς Λουκά μοναχοῦ ὁρισμῶ δὲ τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Ἀνδρονίκου παλαιολόγου τοῦ νέου (sc. Andronicus II. 1320-1341; the Eastern reckoning is ten years later). κύριος δ' ἔπειτα τοῦτο γεγωνὼς Μανουὴλ ὁ ῥήτωρ τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας ἀπῆλειψε τοῦτομα τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου. In Book VI. we have a note headed *μανουὴλ τοῦ ῥήτορος*, protesting against the doctrine of purgatory. Dr. Koetschau rightly identifies him with Manuel of Corinth, who opposed Bessarion at the Council of Florence, where this doctrine was discussed. The MS. was brought from the East to Paris by Minoides Mynas. There are few corrections, and these so skilfully made that they are often hard to detect. The *Panthera* blasphemies occur in full. The note *μετεβλήθη*, κ.τ.λ. is wanting.

From this MS. are copied the two following:—

A. *Paris* (*Bib. Nat.*) 945. Cited by De la Rue as *Codex Regius*.

Here we have (a) the first fourteen chapters of the *Philocalia* and part of the fifteenth, to the words *εἶναι δοκῇ, δείξαι* (Lomm. p. 81.7); (b) the *c. Celsum*; (c) fragments from the *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*, and other writings of Origen given in the *Philocalia*, cc. 23, 24, 27; (d) Extracts from the *Scala Paradisi* of Joannes Climacus.

Three scribes have been at work on the *Philocalia*, by the first of whom the remainder of the volume has been written. His style is that of the fourteenth century, and he is identified in the Library Catalogue with Joachim Hieromonachus, from a note at the end of the *c. Celsum* of apparently much the same date as the MS. itself, though the ink is

blackier: ἄτὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ὑπάρχει ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀνατίθῃμι τοῦτο, εἰς τὴν θείαν μονὴν τοῦ παμμεγίστου μου ταξιάρχου (sc. St. Michael), ὑπὲρ ψυχικῆς σὺς τῶν ἐμῶν γονέων καὶ ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ:—ἰωακείμ ἱερομόναχος. It will be observed, however, that this note asserts Joachim to be the owner merely, not the transcriber. This note is followed by another of a later date: εἰσι δὲ τὰ γράμματα τοῦ μεγάλου ῥήτορος. Probably Manuel is here referred to. The *c. Celsum* is entitled: ἡριγένους τοῦ σοφωτάτου βιβλίον κατὰ Κέλσου τοῦ ἀθεωπάτου. At the top of the pages on which five of the books begin is written in red ink: κῆ ἰθ χῆ νῆ τοῦ θῦ ἐλέησόν με τὸν ἁμαρτωλον. At the end of the treatise: δόξα σοι ὁ θεῖς, ὁ κς ἡμῶν ἰθ χς. ἀμήν.

A few corrections have been made, I think by the original scribe. Variations from the text of *Paris* 616 occur fairly often, but in the large majority of instances they are found in no other MS. Mr. Robinson notes the omission of *βουλομένη*, L. i. 19. 1; ἄλλοι for *ἐθνησι*, i. 37. 16—other instances are found occasionally—where our MS. agrees with *Ven.* 45 as against *Paris* 616. These, I think, can be accounted for: thus the first strange omission may be the result of carelessness, and the second, as he suggests, may be adopted from the *vulgata lectio* of 1 Cor. i. 24, from which the words are quoted. But the important variations of *Ven.* 45 from *Paris* 945 are so numerous that they must have made a far more obvious impression on the text before us if the scribe, as Mr. Robinson is inclined to believe, had seen *Ven.* 45 or any of its descendants.

(B). *Basel*, A. III. 9.

This volume contains (a) the *Philocalia*, transcribed by 'the lowly monk Cyril' in the year 1564. Also in a different handwriting, but of about the same time (b) the *contra Celsum*, and (c) the *Ad Martyrium*.

A few leaves are missing from the opening of the *c. Celsum*. The first page in the MS. begins with *καὶ γῆν σπειρομένην* (L. c. ii. Lomm. i. 32. 14). The text corresponds very closely with that of *Paris* 616, e.g. in the impossible *ῶστε* for *ῥετο* (L. i. 35. 3), the omission of *τοῦ νόμου καὶ* (L. i. 34. 1), and of *μωρία* (i. 36. 4); the interesting substitution of *ἀ* for *ὦν* *κάν* *ἔχνη ἐπὶ ποσσιν*, and the omission of nearly the whole of the two following lines—from *καὶ τινά γε τοῦ εὐράκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς* in the reference to post-apostolic miracles. It is impossible to doubt that the *Basel* MS. has been copied directly from the *Paris* codex.

A comparison of the text of *Vat.* 386 and *Paris* 616 is best postponed until an account has been given of the *Philocalia* texts.

FREDERIC WALLIS.

PATRICK'S HERACLITUS.

The Fragments of the Work of Heraclitus of Ephesus on Nature. Translated from the Greek of Bywater, with an Introduction historical and critical. By G. T. W. PATRICK Ph. D., Professor of Philosophy in the State University of Iowa. Baltimore. N. Murray, 1889. Pp. 131.

THIS book is able and interesting, and if it bears signs of haste, it is to be hoped that the author may have the opportunity of removing them from a second edition.

The reviving interest in Heraclitus, according to Mr. Patrick, is not merely historical. The 'return to Kant,' he says, has been unsuccessful, and 'there is a certain weariness in philosophy of the whole subjective method.' 'The need of disinfecting our minds from the germs of a pathological introspective habit, and putting ourselves as an experiment in the position of those who took it for granted that Nature was larger than man, has led us back to Greek philosophy and especially to its sources.' And Heraclitus is 'the most perfect illustration of those qualities which characterize the Greek mind,—receptivity, unprejudiced freedom of thought, love of order, and trustful confidence in the unity of man and Nature.'

This 'trustful confidence' was prematurely broken by 'what has been called the fall of man in Socrates.' 'Socrates was not a Greek at all.' 'He was a curiosity at Athens, and consequently very much in vogue.'

The point of view thus indicated, if not entirely novel, is fresh and suggestive; and it is maintained with considerable force. Like Bacon, our author longs to know 'what natural thinking would have accomplished if it had been left an open field a while longer in Greece.' But in his eagerness he leaves out of sight some of the essential elements of the position. It is true that Heraclitus anticipated some great ideas which Plato did not find in him. To those well pointed out by Mr. Patrick he might have added the dissipation and conservation of Energy and that which Maxwell ironically apostrophizes (with reference to 'Paradoxical Philosophy')

'Great Principle of all we see,
Unending Continuity!'

But the 'dialectical disturbances' which broke up the speculative vision were rendered inevitable not merely because Socrates had

awakened self-consciousness, or because Anaxagoras had set $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ against the Elements: but much more by reason of the irresistible influence of Parmenides and (the Eleatic) Zeno. That was a challenge to 'clear thinking' which Plato could not put by. Mr. Patrick says: 'Socrates and Plato took fright too easily at the Sophists. Their philosophy would have died with them.' That is all very well. But behind the Sophist stood his 'father Parmenides,' whose thought had penetrated the mind of the age, and become tyrannically dominant. This is strangely overlooked in pp. 72-83. Plato could no more decline to reckon with it, than Kant could have ignored the scepticism of Hume. Nor could mental salvation have been wrought out for man by endlessly repeating or even patiently applying the aphorisms of the Ephesian prophet,—not to say that patience was a hard lesson for the Greek. Whatever may have been the drawbacks of the dialectic $\delta\delta\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha$, and however deplorable may have been its results in times of speculative inertia, it was an indispensable exercise in that period of intellectual youth. Mr. Patrick is probably right in saying that in hypostatizing general concepts Plato was less in earnest than subsequent ages gave him credit for; but why then should he accuse him of elevating rationalism into a great system, and giving it to the world for a perpetual inheritance? The truth is that while our author traces with a firm hand some of the broader outlines in the evolution of philosophy, he betrays now and then a strange obliviousness of the minuter shades. Plato did not write 'in the age of Pericles.' Nor was he so careless of bodily perfection as Mr. Patrick seems to imply.

In the author's critical survey of recent works on Heraclitus there is much that deserves the heartiest approval. He protests with much reason against the 'over-systematization' and 'over-interpretation' of German writers, and shows that these errors have led to contradictory results, making of Heraclitus a hylozoist or a transcendentalist, a materialist or a mystic, a sensationalist or an idealist, according as he is interpreted by Schuster or Teichmüller, by Lassalle or Pfeiderer. In dealing with the isolated fragments of a pregnant thinker it is not always safe to harmonize them with each other, much less to

make them square with some preconceived assumption. Teichmüller, who in his *History of Ideas* has written much and wisely on Heraclitus, supplies two amusingly characteristic specimens of over-interpretation: (1) in explaining the identity of Day and Night to mean that they are products of the same elements, and (2) in disproving the philosopher's belief in immortality by means of the only fragment (perhaps a spurious one) which tends to prove it (cxxii).

Mr. Patrick also deserves credit for laying strong and independent stress (apart from physical or metaphysical doctrines) (1) on the character of Heraclitus and (2) on his ethical and religious utterances. (1) 'The arrogance of this man was sublime.' 'We have in the Ephesian sage a man who openly claimed to have an insight superior to all the world, and the history of thought has vindicated his claim.' 'As the prophets of Israel hurled their messages in actual defiance at the people, hardly more does the Ephesian seem to care how his words are received, if only he gets them spoken. Not more bitter and misanthropic is Hosea in his denunciation of the people's sins, than is our philosopher in his contempt for the stupidity and dulness of the masses.' (2) The ethical content of Heraclitus' message to his countrymen is rightly treated as prior to his speculative teaching. Thus the saying 'Quench insolence more than you would fire' has nothing to do with 'fire' as the first element. The cry of the philosopher was a call to men everywhere to 'wake up, to purify their βαρβάρους ψυχάς, and see things in their reality.' 'He will not have men roll themselves into a cocoon of a single system, or revolve in the circle of a single set of ideas. He will have them throw

themselves open to the common light, keep every sense open and receptive to new impressions, and thereby attain truth, which is found in the universal alone.'

Two other observations command unqualified assent. Mr. Patrick shows that the philosopher's misanthropy was consistent with optimism, i.e. 'with the strong conviction that the world is good, rational and orderly. Most men, to be sure, are fools, but it is their own fault, as they will not put themselves in right relation to the world.' And he does well in calling attention to the thought, which may have figured more largely in the *Book about Nature* than it does in the *Fragments*, viz. that contained in χρημοσύνη or 'hunger,' as 'the impulse or motive force by which the primitive world matter or fire evolved itself into the world of individual things.' The friends of the late Professor Ferrier may recall a cognate saying of his, which is quoted by Principal Shairp in his contribution to the *Introductory Notice* (by Prof. Lushington) prefixed to Ferrier's *Philosophical Remains* (p. xxxiii.).

A good version of the *Fragments* of Heraclitus is still a desideratum. It would supply the only thing which appeared wanting in Mr. Bywater's scholar-like edition. Unfortunately the translation here given of them is marred by grave inaccuracies, to which we call Mr. Patrick's attention, as already said, in the hope that they may be hereafter removed. Surely the suggestions of Professor Gildersleeve, mentioned in the Preface, cannot have been thoroughly attended to. We append a few instances in a tabular form, putting what we hold to be the correct rendering immediately under the Greek. Let scholars judge!

MR. PATRICK'S VERSION.

'The Ephesians deserve, man for man, to be hung, and the youth to leave the city.'

A child's kingdom.'

'The unlike is joined together.'

'And that for smell all things are converted into this.'

CXIV.—'Ἄξιον Ἐφεσίοις ἡβηδὸν ἀπάγξασθαι πᾶσι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέβουσι τὴν πόλιν καταλιπεῖν.

'The Ephesians would do well to hang themselves, every grown-up man of them, and to leave the city to those not yet of age.'

LXXIX.—παῖδες ἡ βασιλείη.

'The government (of the world) is in the hands of a child.'

XLVI.—τὸ ἀντίξουν ξυμφέρων.

'Counter-irritation is helpful.'

XXXVII.—(Arist. *de Sensu*.)

καὶ πάντες ἐπιφέρονται ἐπὶ τοῦτο περὶ ὀσμῆς.

'And all opinions tend this way concerning smell.'

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

WECKLEIN'S ORESTEIA.

Aeschylus' Orestie, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen, von N. WECKLEIN. Mk. 6.

PROF. WECKLEIN is certainly one of the first living authorities on Aeschylus, and has contributed so much to the study of the poet by his various papers and especially by the laborious critical edition of 1885, with its sifted record of emendations, that this edition of the *Oresteia* (the first, he tells us, with a German commentary) deserves and will receive the most respectful attention.

In the Preface we are told that the work is chiefly devoted to explanation, and the student who wishes for further critical research into the text is referred to the 1885 edition. The latter however gives very little but a classified list of suggestions, valuable as that is; and we think the editor's own work on the text will be more clearly seen and more fairly judged from the book before us. There is here more discussion, though still too little: the emendations are all printed in the text: the wood is not so obscured by the trees as in the bewildering Appendix of 1885: the commentary helps us to understand the grounds of preference: and lastly in several cases the views of 1885 have been modified.

Perhaps it may be going too far to say with the editor that 'the greatest difficulties [of the text in these three plays] have been overcome and comparatively few obscurities remain': but we think a study of this edition will confirm his statement that 'the text-criticism of the *Oresteia* has made in the last few decades gratifying progress.' The age of certain conjectures is perhaps over: but much has been recently done, and still is being done, in detecting corruption: and many recent suggestions, though in the nature of the case incapable of proof, may yet be accepted as probable; while the total result certainly is that the text as a whole still slowly improves.

Among those of Prof. Wecklein's own suggestions which deserve consideration may be mentioned the following (where the references are to his edition, the numbers in brackets being those of Dindorf's *Poetae Scenici*):—

Ag. 103 λύπης ἄτην φρενοδαλῇ for the corrupt τὴν θυμοφθόρον λύπης φρένα, where ἄτην is due to H. L. Ahrens, and φρενοδαλῇ is supposed to have been supplanted by the gloss θυμοφθόρον.

152 [145] φάσματ' ἀνορθοῖν for φάσματα στρουθῶν which is meaningless. This ingenious suggestion he supports by a reference to the formula (*Pers.* 220, *El.* 644) whereby one who has seen a vision prays 'avert the bad, fulfil the good.'

300 [288] ἤπεικτο for the desperate πεύκη το. The meaning is what is wanted, if the form could be accepted. Anyhow the το is probably the end of some verb, as many other editors have seen.

680 [675] προσδόκα καμῖν for π. μολεῖν. The sentence εἰ δ' σὺν τις ἀκτίς κ.τ.λ. (676) certainly looks as if the messenger had said 'expect bad news of Menelaos.'

720 [718] in the famous simile of the lion's whelp, M. reads ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντα σίνιν [λέοντος ἴνιν Con.] δόμοις ἀγάλακτον οὕτως ἀνὴρ φιλόμαστον, generally translated, 'Thus a man rears a lion's whelp in the house, robbed of its mother's milk, desiring the breast': but it is obvious that οὕτως is harsh in position and the two adjectives unsatisfactory. Wecklein brilliantly suggests (adopting a hint from Heusde's βότας) ἀγάλακτα βούτας ἀνὴρ φιλομάστον, 'a herdsman rears a lion's whelp, the foster-brother of the sucklings of the herd.'

794 [803] θάρσος ἐτώσιον for θράσος ἐκούσιον.

1139 [1143] φοιταλαίαις for φεῦ ταλαίαις (restoring the dochmiac): less happily in antistr. μοιριδίαις for ὀρθίαις ἐν.

Cho. 343 [344] φιάλην νεοκράτα for the strange (though perhaps possible) νεοκράτα φίλον.

Cho. 818 [821] θηλύθρον χοροστάταν for θῆλυν οὐριοστάταν.

Eum. 178 MSS. μιάστορ' ἐκείνον πάσεται, unmetrical and corrupt. Wecklein (1885) ἐγόνου (1888) ἐκ σίνους. The latter admirably ingenious, but not a very natural expression.

485 [483] the MSS. read:—

φόνων δικαστὺς ὀρκίον αἰρουμένους
θεσμὸν τὸν εἰς ἅπαντ' ἐγὼ θήσω χρόνον—

usually corrected ὀρκίους αἰρουμένην with Casaubon. Wecklein suggests now (1888) φανῶ δικαστὺς ὀρκ. αἰδουμένους θεσμὸν, τὸν κ.τ.λ.

Eum. 570 [567] εἰς οὐρανὸν δὲ διάτορος Τυρσηνικῇ for ἧ τ' οὖν δ.τ.

Eum. 688 [685] ἐδεῖται for Ἄρειον (not in 1885 edition).

Eum. 942 [941] τὸ μὴ περᾶν ὄρον λοπῶν for . . τόπων.

Opinions will doubtless differ on the value or probability of some of these conjectures: but taken as a whole we may say they show in a high degree ingenuity combined with sobriety of judgment—a combination rarer than might be wished among emenders of texts.

On the other hand there are some renderings and not a few emendations adopted (from conjectures of others or of the editor's own) which will not equally commend themselves to the reader. Thus, *Ag.* 79 [78], to alter Ἄρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρῃ to ἐνὶ πείσῃ on the strength of a Hesychius note that ἐν πείσῃ means ἐν χώρῃ, seems arbitrary. So does the correction οὐδ' ὄψαν' ἂν λέγοιμι *Ag.* 287 [275] for the unexceptionable δόξαν of the MSS. The correction βάλλεται δ' ὀρόγκοις for β. γὰρ ὄσσοις, *Ag.* 475 [470] is ingenious, but surely improbable. The word ὀρόγκοις is only known from Hesychius: and the illustration, though fine, is too abrupt. For the extraordinary μάταν γὰρ εἶπ' ἂν ἐσθλά τις δοκῶν ὀρᾶν (*Ag.* 431 [423]), 'For vainly would a man, seeming to see fair visions, clutch at them (εἶπο)', Keek is responsible. The fine passage ἧ δίκτυόν τι Ἄϊδον; ἄλλ' ἄρκυς ἧ ξίνευνος κ.τ.λ. (*Ag.* 1103 [1115]) becomes ἧ δίκτυον τιταίνει δάμαρ κυσὶ ξίνευνος ἃ ξυναίτια Ἄϊδον: a singular piece of ingenuity wholly wasted, for it surely cannot mean, as Prof. Wecklein would have it, 'Or does the wedded wife spread a net, she the accomplice of the Furies (dogs of Hades).' The order makes this absolutely impossible: and even if it were possible, it is far from being an improvement in sense. Still less acceptable (in the antistrophe of the same stanza) is our editor's reading and rendering. The MSS. have ἐν πέπλοισιν μελαγκέρῳ (corrected to acc. M.) λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι. Wecklein reads ἐν πέπλωνιν κ.τ.λ. and explains as follows:—'the two outstretched hands are the black horns, so that the contrivance (das Ding) appears black-horned, and Klytaemnestra herself a raging bull (ein wild wütender Stier) charging with its horns a defenceless cow.' Imagine Agamemnon a cow, and Klytaemnestra a bull! In the difficult passage ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπὶ γαγεν εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς (1447) Wecklein has corrected εὐνῆς . . . τῆς to εὐνῆν τήνδ' (partly following Voss), and explains the εὐνῆ as the lying of Kassandra in death beside Agamemnon, translating 'for me she has brought in this couch an added relish to my joy,' i.e. my delight in the murder of Agamemnon is enhanced by the thought that Kassandra lies dead beside him. The sense is appropriate: but again does not the order of the

words seem to make the correction τήνδε impossible?

In the *Choephoroi*, the powerful and difficult passage about the penalties on delayed vengeance (275—295) is rejected by our editor (following Dindorf) as a later addition, though he admits the 'strong and peculiar colouring of the expression': few, we think, will ascribe it to other than the poet. In the striking but corrupt chorus 645—8 [649—51] Wecklein follows Lachmann in reading τίνεω (for which there is much to be said), but he takes it all as one sentence thus:

τέκνον δ' ἐπεισφέρει δόμοις
αἰμάτων παλαιτέρων
τίνεω μύσος
χρόνῳ κλυτὰ βυσσόφρων Ἐρινύς—

explaining it 'And at length the deep-brooding Erinys takes from Aisa the product (das Erzeugnis) of her forging, and brings it into the guilty house, to pay for the old murder with new.' The sense is clear and consistent: but the meaning given to τέκνον is surely both harsh and unpoetical. According as we punctuate, τέκνον must be either Orestes, or the new murder, child of the old. Objections from the poetical side may also be raised against ἄλλοισιν ἐν νόμοισι, our editor's correction in *Eum.* 96 for ἃ. ἐ. νεκροῖσι, though it suits the general sense: against ἀναιμάτων βόσκημα δ', αἰμόνων σκιά (for the corrupt δαιμόνων *Eum.* 302) in spite of its ingenuity: against βαρίβαν (word for 'mariner' quoted in Bekk. *Anecd.* from Sophokles, ποιμένες) which Wecklein following Meineke reads for the corrupt περαιβάδαν *Eum.* 556: and emphatically against πανευμενίδες, τῶν for πᾶν ἐνδαίδες οἶκον in the last stanza of the play.

On the important question of the meaning of the vote of Athena in the *Eumenides*, Wecklein has a long and (as it appears to us) a conclusive note, supporting the view that the Areopagites are divided equally, and that Athena's is the casting vote. On any other view the human judges must condemn by a majority of one, which the goddess reverses: and this destroys the symbolism of the action, which surely lies in the fact that the guilt of the two murders balance, and human judgment being at fault the goddess decides for mercy.

On another difficult question in the *Eumenides*, the speech of Athena founding the court of Areopagos, 684 [681] *sqq.*, the editor who formerly (1885) approved Kirchhoff's transposing of the passage to 576, now agrees with Dindorf that it is probably in its present shape not due to Aeschylus (Introd.

p. 22). There certainly are many difficulties, and opinion will probably be divided, but to most people we think the difficulties of retaining the passage in its place will be less than those of rejecting or transposing it.

Lastly there is much to be said for the view adopted in this edition that the system of refrains which appears in the MSS. of the choruses, *Eum.* 342, 811, 870, should be extended to other places. Our editor, following G. C. W. Schneider, restores them with great probability in *Choeph.* 796, 813, 837,

953, 970; and also in *Eumen.* 368, 383; in the first of which places however there is a real difficulty connected with the word ἀνα-τροπᾶς (that in the refrain has to lose its construction); a difficulty on which Prof. Wecklein's explanation is hardly satisfactory.

It should be added that in the Introduction there is an excellent and instructive account given of the history of the Myth of the Pelopidae, and of Aeschylus's handling of it, including some interesting notes on works of art that illustrate the story.

A. S.

SOME BOOKS ON XENOPHON.

- (1) *Xenophon Cyropaedia.* Books III.—V. with Notes by the Rev. H. A. HOLDEN M.A. LL.D. (Pitt Press Series). Text, pp. 128. Notes, pp. 182. Indices, pp. 44. 5s.

The second instalment of Dr. Holden's excellent edition of Xenophon's biographical romance is extremely welcome. It is full of those admirable features which have made Dr. Holden's editions of classical authors not only useful and popular in England, but the subject of eulogy to foreign scholars. The text has been carefully revised with constant reference to the best MSS. and to the critical work of his predecessors: but Dr. Holden seems wisely conservative in the matter of emendation; and, while giving full weight to all suggestions of the great critics, is not to be frightened even by Cobet's *scioli emblemata*. The notes are many rather than long, and leave nothing to be desired in the way of scholarly interpretation, grammatical explanation, or suggestive reference. In one or two places we have noted that Dr. Holden has perhaps been so concise as to be in danger of misleading a young scholar. For instance IV. iii. l. 98 'ἐξ ἴσου = ex eadem statione;' III. iii. l. 165 'ἐπὶ ἐκαλλιέησιν cum litavisset.' In V. l. 64 the middle is used in the same sense. But is not the middle used of the person consulting the victims, the active always with τὰ ἱερά expressed or understood? Again at III. iii. l. 419 the extract from Rich's Dictionary as to the Roman *tessera militaris* gives an inadequate account of it, as may be seen by a reference to the best authority, Polybius, 6, 36. A good feature in the notes is the attention paid to the particles, than which scarcely anything is more helpful

NO. XXVIII. VOL. III.

towards catching the finer shades of meaning of Greek writers. There are admirable indices to the volume, so constructed as to give a clear indication of Xenophon's use of poetical, Ionic, Doric or rare words, on the plan of Gustav Sauppe. It is an honourable addition to the Pitt Press series, and a real boon to all students of Xenophon and of Greek generally.

- (2) *Xenophon's Hellenica.* Books I. II. with Introduction and Notes by G. E. UNDERHILL, M.A. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1888. Introduction, pp. 1—51. Text with English Analysis, pp. 53—135. Notes, pp. 39. Index, pp. 9.

The text is well printed and follows that of Dindorf (1885) with a few changes. Dates are given in the margin, and a helpful analysis let into the text. The aim of the notes is stated in the preface to be 'not only to explain the critical and grammatical difficulties in the text...but also to supply a commentary upon the history of the times, and to point out, even at the risk of repetition, the numerous gaps and points of obscurity in Xenophon's narrative.' The first of these two departments is not very fully treated, the notes being chiefly historical, and those on construction or meaning being few and far between. The second is much more satisfactorily dealt with; and there are some really good and exhaustive dissertations on special points, such, for instance, as the Spartan *vavapχία*. The introduction contains a clear and fairly complete sketch of Greek History between 411 and 403, with an excellent chronological table, and a sensible

D D

disquisition on the composition of the book. The differences of style and method between Books I. II. and the rest of the *Hellenica* are indeed very marked; and may perhaps be accounted for, as Mr. Underhill supposes, by their composition at a widely different time, or by supposing Xenophon to be writing under the restraint of a conscious attempt to imitate the method of Thucydides; and, again, to have left the book unfinished. The theory of a different authorship of the two parts has never, I believe, been seriously maintained; but there is a passage in Plutarch, *de gloria Atheniensium* I., which it is perhaps worth while to quote, as showing that the period embraced in these two books had been treated by another contemporary, and that it would almost seem that Plutarch did not regard Xenophon as the historian of the time. He is showing that without the glorious deeds of Athens we should not have had the famous writers. After mentioning the events treated by Thucydides, he goes on:—*ἄνελε τὰ περὶ Ἑλλησποντον Ἀλκιβιάδου νεανειύματα καὶ τὰ πρὸς Δέσβον Θρασύλλου, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ Θηραμένους τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας κατάλυσιν καὶ Θρασύβουλον καὶ Ἀρχιππον, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ Φυλῆς ἐβδομήκοντα κατὰ τῆς Σπαρτιατῶν ἡγεμονίας ἀνισταμένους καὶ Κόνωνα πάλιν ἐμβιβάζοντα τὰς Ἀθήνας εἰς τὴν θάλατταν καὶ Κράτιππος ἀνήρηται. Ξενοφῶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ γέγονεν ἱστορία, κ.τ.λ.* We know nothing of this continuator of Thucydides; but it is possible that Xenophon embodied part of his work in his two first books; or, on the other hand, that the existence of this work of Cratippus may account for some of the many omissions in Xenophon's narrative which Mr. Underhill notices.

- (3) *Ξενοφώντος ἀπομνημονεύματα* recognovit WALTHER GILBERT. Editio major. Lips. Teubner, 1888. Praefatio, pp. iii.—lxxvii. Summaria, pp. lxxviii.—lxxx. Textus, pp. 1—143. Index nominum, pp. 146—150. Mk. 1.

An excellent text of the *Memorabilia*, with a very satisfactory critical apparatus. The readings of the two best MSS. A and B are always given, Schenkl's collation of C, and all readings of other MSS. that seem possibly admissible. Variations from the texts of Dindorf, Sauppe, Schenkl, and Breitenbach are marked; while mere conjectures of Cobet, Hirschig and others are more sparingly noticed (*tamen plures quam vellem memoravi*). The destructive criticisms of A. Krohn are also recorded as well as those of the slightly

more conservative J. T. Hartmann. The critical views of the editor seem sound and sensible, and the book is well printed and convenient in every way.

- (4) *Xenophons Memorabilien für den Schulgebrauch*. ANDREAS WEIDNER. Vienna and Leipzig, 1889. Introduction, pp. iv.—xii. Text, pp. 1—162. Index, 162—170. Pfg. 80.

A text in good clear type on good paper. It has no note or comment; but there are four short essays of about a page each on (1) Sokrates' Leben (2) Sokrates' Lehre (3) Sokrates' Verfolgung und Tod (4) Sokrates' Ankläger und Vertheidiger nach dem Tod; a short analysis of each chapter, and an index of proper names. The object is said in the preface to be to place a clear and intelligible text in the hands of school-boys, without troubling them with disputed points of criticism; and this object is attained. A few passages (e.g. 2, 1, § 4—6), held to be clearly spurious, are printed at the bottom of the page in a different type.

- (5) *Xenophon's Anabasis*. C. REHDANTZ, First Volume, Books I.—III. Sixth edition, revised by Dr. OTTO CARNUTH. Weidmann, Berlin, 1888. Einleitung, pp. 1—36. Text and Notes, pp. 37—217. Mk. 1.80.

This reissue of Rehdantz's well-known edition of the *Anabasis* has been enriched by reference to five recent contributions to the subject; (1) Droysen's article on Greek Warfare in Hermann's *Lehrbuch* of Greek Antiquities, (2) Hartmann's *Analecta Xenophontea*, (3) Mangeldorf's *Zu Xenophons Bericht über die Schlacht bei Kunaxa*, (4) Reuss' Critical and exegetical remarks on Xenophon's *Anabasis*, (5) Schulze's *quaestiones grammaticae ad Xenophontem pertinentes*. There is a good map of the March, a plan of the battle of Cunaxa, and some engravings of Greek and Persian armour at the end of the volume.

- (6) *Xenophons Agesilaos für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, von OTTO GÜTHLING, Leipzig. Teubner, 1888. Einleitung, pp. 1—5. Text and Notes (German), pp. 6—66. Critical Appendix, p. 67. Index, pp. 67—68. Mk. 1.50.

The editor maintains the Xenophontean authorship of this treatise, and explains the

difference of style and vocabulary from the other writings of Xenophon by the fact that the tract is avowedly a panegyric, and that to such a composition poetical words and expressions are suitable, as well as a selection of facts (on which subject see Polybius' remarks on his own panegyric on Philopomen, 10, 21). The eleventh chapter, he admits, was most likely added by the editor of the work after Xenophon's death. The notes are terse and suitable to the writer's object. Illustrative passages are mostly taken from Xenophon himself, and the student is frequently referred to Krüger's Grammar.

(7) *Analecta Xenophontea*. J. T. HARTMANN, Lit. Hum. Dr. Lugdun.-Batav. 1887.

Dr. Hartmann is of the school of Cobet, for whom he professes unbounded reverence, and would emend his author on general principles of probability, and from considering what the grammatical construction and the general sense of the passage in question demand, or the known usage of the Attic writers suggests, with scant regard to the authority of the *libri meliores vel deteriores*: for, *detrimenti enim meliores isti libri sunt . . . nostro hac in re standum est iudicio et audendum est aliquid*. It is hardly necessary, therefore, to say that he is in sympathy with the most advanced methods of destructive criticism; and that in no inconsiderable number of cases his reader will find himself differing from the critic, and inclined to regard the alterations proposed as unnecessary or even wanton. Indeed it has seemed to the present writer that the work, valuable as it is, has suffered from the very devotion to this particular author on which Dr. Hartmann rather prides himself, and that a wider reference to other Greek writers than appears in this volume might have often modified the writer's views, and made a certain proportion of the criticism unnecessary.

But when this has been said, it still remains an undoubted fact that these four hundred pages contain a most valuable body of criticism on Xenophon, supported with great ingenuity and acuteness, and which no future student or editor of Xenophon will be able to neglect. They are, besides, most amusing and almost delightful reading. It is pleasant to find a scholar in these days still capable of writing a long book in Latin in a style so clear, attractive and elegant. Possibly here and there some exception might be taken to the Latinity; but if it is not wholly classical

it is something even better,—a really individual style, never wearisome, and always perspicuous and able to awaken and hold attention.

The treatise is divided into twelve chapters. In chapter I the writer discusses the question of the year of Xenophon's birth, and maintains with great ingenuity that it was as late as B.C. 426. The second chapter is devoted to a discussion *de Anabasis consilio tempore scriptore*. Here he maintains that the first four books were published shortly after the end of the expedition, under the pseudonym of Themistogenes, the last three much later, and with the express object of defending his character against the attacks of his enemies. Chapter III. contains an investigation of the uses of *μήν* in Xenophon, in which he shows that it is frequently and naturally employed in a work like the *Memorabilia* where a proposition is to be proved by numerous examples, and less frequently in continuous narratives and addresses. The object is to show that its use or non-use cannot help to decide for or against the genuineness of a particular treatise without regard to its nature. There follow a number of emendations on the books of the *Anabasis* which every reader will perhaps view differently. They do not appear to the present writer always convincing or always necessary. To take the very first, for instance. In the sentence (1, 1 § 5) *πάντας οὕτω διατιθεῖς ἀπερίμπετο ὥστε αὐτῷ μᾶλλον φίλους εἶναι ἢ βασιλεῖ*, Dr. Hartmann objects to the present participle, to the neglect, as it seems to us, of the Attic idiom which employs a present participle in reference to past time to indicate a series of actions. Again in 1, 4, 18 his objection to *σαφῶς* appears hypercritical if not absurd. In 6, 5, 16 *ὅρᾳτε δὴ πότερον κρείττον ἵεναι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας προβαλομένους τὰ ὅπλα ἢ μεταβαλομένους ὅπισθεν ἡμῶν ἐπώντας τοὺς πολεμίους θεᾶσθαι*, Hartmann's comment is—*quomodo aliquis spectare posset hostes a tergo se insequentes non video. Paratam tamen medicinam non habeo*. Surely the *medicina* is to take *μεταβαλομένους* to mean 'having faced about' [cp. Aelian *Tact.* 21, 24 *εἰ δὲ διπλῇ (κλίσει) γίγνοιτο ἀποστρέφει τὴν ὄψιν εἰς τὸ κάτω. τοῦτ' δὲ ἥδη μεταβολὴ καλεῖται*]. So in 7, 2, 28 his objection to *διαβαίνειν* disappears if the Greek usage of the present for an intention in the immediate future is taken into consideration. There are other objections which might be urged to some of his criticisms (he is generally more fertile in pointing out difficulties than in suggesting their remedy), but it is enough to suggest a caution in accepting all

his conclusions, and it will repay any reader to study them for himself. The fifth chapter discusses the *Memorabilia*. Here Dr. Hartmann is a thorough-going follower of Schenkl and Krohn, who used the knife with such astonishing freedom. True he controverts in nine cases the excisions or objections of Schenkl, but he makes up for that by many more of his own. He believes in an *interpolator impudentissimus*, who, editing the treatise after Xenophon's death, foisted in the parts which he condemns as foolish or ill-written or false. This was rendered all the more easy as the treatise, even as Xenophon wrote it, was not consecutive, but had been continually added to during the author's life. The sixth chapter contains emendations on the text of the *Memorabilia* left after these excisions. The seventh chapter discusses the *Oeconomicus*. He rejects the suggestion that it ever formed, or was intended to form, part of the *Memorabilia*, and defends his position at great length and with full illustration. The eighth chapter (pp. 188-213) again contains emendations on particular passages of the *Oeconomicus*. The ninth chapter discusses the old question of the connexion between the *Convivium* of Xenophon and that of Plato. He confesses that the arguments which he here uses are not new; and it will be enough to say that his position is that Plato's *Convivium* was published after that of Xenophon and was intended to refute and ridicule the presentment of Socrates contained in the latter's work. The tenth chapter follows (pp. 235-246) with emendations on the text of the *Convivium*. In the eleventh chapter—which has the motto *τίς ἀλλή τὸν θανόντ' ἀπικτανεύει*;—he restates the case against the genuineness of the *Agesilaus*. This he rests on (1) its rhetorical style, alien to that of Xenophon, (2) its affected and poetical diction, (3) its false statements, (4) direct borrowing from the *Hellenica* of passages which the writer has either tried to make more definite and particular, or has spoilt by failing to understand, or has deliberately changed in order to do greater honour to Agesilaus, (5) statements and observations not suited to the time at which Xenophon must have composed the piece, if he had done so. To this array of historical arguments are added certain critical difficulties, and the use of certain *verba locutionesque insolentiora aut suspecta*. The upshot of it all is to show that the *Agesilaus* is by a young declaimer of the School of Isocrates. Dr. Hartmann however feels that the very number of the arguments makes it the less certain that a reader will be convinced, for the detection of a weak point in any one shakes his confidence in all. He appeals therefore finally to the finer sense of readers... *qui enim non sentit Agesilaum a Xenophonte non esse scriptum, eum nullis convinces argumentis*. The twelfth and last chapter (pp. 276-405) is devoted to criticisms and emendations of the *Hellenica*. They are full both of the strength and weakness of the critic; and, while they will often carry conviction, they will also sometimes call forth opposition, and occasionally provoke a smile. It may be safely said, however, that the book as a whole contains a mass of criticism on Xenophon of first-rate value. It certainly is entertaining, and has scarcely a dull page from end to end. And whether a reader agrees or disagrees with the author, he will undoubtedly close the book with awakened interest in and a fuller knowledge of Xenophon.

E. S. SHUCKBURGH.

SELECTIONS FROM THE ATTIC ORATORS.

Selections from the Attic Orators, Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, edited with notes by R. C. JEBB, Litt. D., Camb., [late] Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Second Edition. London: Macmillan, 1888.

TEACHERS of Greek have good reason for rejoicing that a book, which has been before the public for the last nine years as a companion volume ranging in size with the editor's brilliant and attractive work on the

Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus, has now been reprinted in a handy form that will make it readily accessible to a still larger number of students. It is superfluous at the present date to praise the taste and judgment which have here been applied to the difficult task of selecting adequately representative specimens of the earlier Attic Orators, or to dwell on the scrupulous pains which have been bestowed on the explanatory as well as the critical notes. In the new edition the latter, instead of being placed

apart before the text, are far more conveniently printed at the foot of the page, while the explanatory notes remain as before at the end of the book.

The few suggestions here offered for the removal of some misprints and other trifling inaccuracies will be almost entirely confined to the speech of Lysias on behalf of Manti-theus (*Or.* 16), that of Isaeus on the estate of Dicæogenes (*Or.* 5), and the *Aegineticus* of Isocrates (*Or.* 19).

In the explanatory note on Lysias 16 § 7, οὐτε κατὰστασιν παραλαβόντα, Prof. Jebb rightly states that 'Bake reads καταβαδόντα, which could hardly = refunded'; but it ought to be added that this proposal, though approved by Sauppe, was afterwards retracted by Bake himself in favour of λαβόντα, in his *Scholica Hypomnemata*, V 162-3, published in 1862:—'re iterum iterumque considerata, dubitare coepi an vere dixerim.' The work just quoted is little known in England, but English scholars may turn with interest to the preface of its second volume, published in 1839. They will there find an account of the pleasant impression produced at Leyden by the visit (in 1816) of Gaisford, Professor of Greek at Oxford, and (in 1815) of Dobree, one of Professor Jebb's predecessors in the Chair of Greek at Cambridge.

In the text of § 15 of the same speech, μάλιστα τῆς ἡμετέρας φυλῆς δυστυχρήσας καὶ πλείστον ἐν θανάοντων, the last word is rightly altered into ἐναποθανόντων. In the critical note, the editor says: 'ἐναποθανόντων is my correction of ἐθανόντων, adding that 'Markland conjectured ἔνθα or ἐνταῦθα θανόντων.' The authority for this statement, which unintentionally does a slight injustice to Markland, is apparently the preface to Scheibe's second edition (the true date of which, by the way, is 1862 and not 1876, which is only the date of a reprint with a fresh title-page). Scheibe there says: 'Markland vel ἔνθα θανόντων, quod vereor ut Lysianum sit, vel ἐνταῦθα θανόντων, quod malim. Certe ἐναποθανόντων usitatius erat.' Thus ἐναποθανόντων had already been vaguely suggested by Scheibe; but Scheibe himself has quoted Markland inaccurately, and in particular has omitted to mention that it was Markland who, among several alternatives, was the first to propose this very correction, ἐναποθανόντων. I quote from Markland's *coniecturae*, printed in 1738, as an appendix to Taylor's *Lysias*, p. 576: 'vox ἐνθανόντων, quae praecedat, depravata est. Conieceram ἐνθα θανόντων. Sed Lysianum magis foret ἐνταῦθα ἀποθανόντων, vel ἐν α π ο

θ α γ ό ν τ ω ν. Vide Thuc. ii. 52.' In Dobson's *Oratores Attici*, the same emendation is ascribed to the French editor, Auger; but, as I have shown, it was an English scholar who was the first to suggest it in a timid and tentative way, leaving Professor Jebb to propose it afresh and to print it with confidence as part of the text.—In the explanatory note on § 13, the Athenian expedition for the relief of Haliartus is by a misprint attributed to B.C. 325, instead of 395 which is correctly printed in the former edition. Again, in the note on § 19 the apt quotation ἐπιφθονός ἐστι καὶ τάχως βαδίζει καὶ μέγα φθέγγεται has accidentally been assigned to *Dem. adv. Callippum*, instead of *adv. Pantaenetus*.

On Isaeus, *Or.* 5 § 17, ψευδομαρτυρῶν is in both editions misprinted ψευδομαρτυρῶν, the modern compositor having thus made a similar slip to that of the ancient copyist in the well-known passage of Aristotle's *Politics* ii. 12, as emended in Bentley's *Phalaris*: Χαρῶνδον ἴδιον μὲν οὐδέν ἐστιν, πλὴν αἱ δίκαι τῶν ψευδομαρτυριῶν, κ.τ.λ. In the next note (on ἐξαίρεθεισὼν τῶν ψήφων), Dobree's emendation is in both editions printed ἐξεραθεισὼν, instead of ἐξεραθεισῶν. In the note on § 23, the reference for ἄν προσχωρήσειν should be Thuc. ii. 80 (not ii. 8).

Turning to some pages of greater literary interest in another part of the volume, I notice in passing that, in the remarks on the influence of Isocrates on the Latin style of Cicero, Professor Jebb appeals, as before, to the passage of Cicero, *ad Att.* ii. 1, where he speaks of himself as 'using all the fragrant essences of Isocrates and all the little stores of his disciples'; but, to quote the courteous criticism of Professor Wilkins, 'it ought not to have been overlooked that in the words so admirably rendered Cicero is speaking of a work written in *Greek*' (Introd. to *De Oratore*, p. 36 of first ed., 1879). On Isocrates, *Aegineticus*, § 21, Troezen, by a perhaps needless but not unwelcome redundancy of information, is described as situated 'just opposite the little island of Calauria (where Demosthenes died—now *Poro*, πόρος, because the narrow strait can sometimes be forded).' This is just one of those descriptive touches which add vividness to an oral exposition in the lecture-room, but are perhaps best omitted in a printed commentary, though the student of these selections may not be sorry, while reading of Troezen in Isocrates, to be reminded how near it was to the scene of the death of Demosthenes.—In the note on § 26, the penultimate of ἐμπυος is marked long, as being a derivative of a word which is here

printed πῶν with the circumflex accent on the first syllable. The penultimate is also marked long in Ellendt's *lexicon Sophocleum*, in Pape, and in the sixth edition of Liddell and Scott; in the seventh the quantity is not marked. In *Soph. Phil.* 1378 (as is well known) the position of ἔμπος leaves the quantity undetermined. But, as I have endeavoured to show in an *excursus* on the *Select Private Orations* of Demosthenes, ii. p. 226, ed. 2, the quantity may be ascertained (i.) by the accent of πῶν, which, according to the grammarian Arcadius, should never be written πῶν, and (ii.) by the fact that Empedocles makes the first syllable of πῶν short. The derivative is actually found with the penultimate short in a poetic description of a powerful antidote, written by Andromachus the elder and quoted by Galen xiii p. 876 :

καὶ μογερῶν στέρνων ἀπολύσεται ἔμ π ο ν ἰλύν
 τι ο μ ῆ ν πολλοὺς μέχρ' ἐπ' ἡελίουσ.

It may be interesting to look forward to the expression of Professor Jebb's deliberate opinion on this perhaps unimportant point, if he cares to discuss it in the edition of the *Philoctetes* which is now in the press. In the preface to his edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, he has explained that it was 'as a preparation, in one department, for the task of editing Sophocles that the special studies embodied in the *Attic Orators*' were 'originally undertaken.' Many, besides the present writer, are grateful for all that he has done for the Greek Orators by allowing that which was begun to a certain extent ἐν παρέργῳ μέρει to be extended beyond its immediate scope; for we may fitly apply to Professor Jebb what Plato says in praise of geometry: καὶ γὰρ τὰ πάρεργα αὐτοῦ οὐ σμικρά. A still larger number will welcome the speedy completion of his monumental edition of Sophocles.

J. E. SANDYS.

LYSIAS, SELECT ORATIONS.

Ausgewählte Reden des Lysias, erklärt von R. RAUCHENSTEIN, besorgt von KARL FUHR.
 Tenth ed. part I containing Or. 12, 13, 25, 16 and 31. Weidmann, Berlin. 1889. 1 m. 50 pf.

THE first edition of this excellent school-book was published in 1848 when the editor was fifty years of age. He lived thirty years longer, and during that time saw his work go through six editions, all of them carefully revised by himself. I have before me a copy of the fifth edition which he was good enough to send me in 1869, with a few lines of kindly greeting written in a clear though somewhat tremulous hand, when he was already over seventy. For fifty-five years in all, he was, in various capacities, on the staff of the school at Aarau in Switzerland; and since his death in 1879, three further editions of his work have been seen through the press by a thoroughly competent scholar, Karl Fuhr of Elberfeld.

In the preface to the eighth and tenth editions, Fuhr urges the necessity for a new critical edition of the whole of Lysias, including a complete record of all the conjectural emendations, and ascribing each to its first proposer. Many emendations, as he justly observes, are now-a-days put forward as new

which have already been suggested by Markland and Reiske. In the preface to the ninth he complains that Cobet, in his second edition of 1882, had entirely neglected all that had been done for the textual criticism of the author during the thirty years that had elapsed since the first edition of Scheibe. Some allowance may perhaps be made for a veteran scholar who re-edits a text of Lysias when on the verge of seventy, and who shortly after that time, as I well remember observing during a visit to Leyden in 1885, found himself compelled to place on the university screens the following notice in lieu of the ordinary announcement of a course of lectures: *Professor Cobet, propter aetatem immunis, commilitonum studia quantum poterit adiuvabit.* A similar excuse can hardly be pleaded on behalf of the editor of the English edition of select speeches of Lysias, founded on Rauchenstein's first edition, *deren Herausgeber...* (as Fuhr complains) *mit der neueren Litteratur ebenfalls ganz unbekannt ist.*

As to the much disputed date of the birth of Lysias, the ten successive editions of Rauchenstein's book reflect the changes of opinion that have prevailed during the last forty years. Thus the first and second accept 459, the third and fourth 432, the

fifth 444, while the sixth and seventh revert to 459. The eighth, ninth and tenth editions have veered round once more in favour of 'about 444,' the date proposed by K. F. Hermann, and viewed with favour by Blass. This date has, at any rate, the advantage of not requiring us to believe, with those who hold to 459, that Lysias was more than 55 years of age when he adopted the profession of logographer in 403. On this subject it is well observed by Prof. Wilkins in his Introduction to the *De Oratore*, p. 33: 'In his speech against Eratosthenes delivered in that year he speaks of himself as quite a novice in public business or public speaking, never having brought or defended an action. It is surely more probable that he is speaking here as a man of forty than as a man of fifty-five.'

The preface of the tenth edition acknowledges the help derived from Albrecht's excellent review of the recent literature of Lysias, describes the school-edition by Kocks, published at Gotha in 1885-7, as having proved of very slight service, while with some reservations it praises that of Weidner (reviewed in these pages ii. 114) for its fresh and stimulating treatment of the text. In the present text there is nothing that calls for special notice beyond the fact that all the square brackets used in the previous editions to indicate interpolations have been removed, the words formerly bracketed being now entirely discarded from the text. In

matters of spelling increasing weight is given to the evidence of inscriptions. Thus we now have, instead of *σώζειν* and *νιέειν*, *σώζειν* and *νιέειν*. The occasional remarks on textual criticism formerly interspersed in the commentary are now transferred to the critical appendix, which is in general a very careful piece of work, though here, as in other excellent editions, Bake's conjecture *καταβαλόντα* (*Or.* 16 § 7) is recorded without a hint of the fact that he afterwards withdrew it.

The book as a whole is the best school-edition of Lysias in existence, and the experiment might well be made of using such an edition in English schools where German forms part of the regular work of boys who are giving their main attention to Latin and Greek. It is a matter of regret that so few of those who work for Classical honours at Cambridge can on first coming from school use a German edition, much less read a German book, with any facility. Some have even been allowed to drop their French and German with a view to concentrating themselves exclusively on Classics, and have found out, when it was almost too late to repair the mischief, that in many matters of learning and research they are thus placed at a disadvantage with respect to others who have had a less narrow education.

J. E. SANDYS.

THE ECLOGUES AND GEORGICS OF VIRGIL.

The Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil. Translated by J. W. MACKAIL. (Rivingtons.) 5s.

THIS translation is superior to that of the *Aeneid* by the same author; it is more uniformly good, more evenly sustained, though in chosen passages of the *Aeneid* Mr. Mackail showed, perhaps, higher imaginative power. Here, the *Georgics* are good from beginning to end, not only in the epic or lyrical passages, such as form the conclusion of *Georg.* i. and iv., but in the more technical and didactic parts, which nothing but Virgil's supreme skill in style could save from being dry and formal. The *Eclogues*, though often rendered with beauty and grace, are on the whole slightly disappointing; they challenge a comparison, which

they can scarcely bear, with Mr. Lang's *Theocritus*. By the rest of his work, Mr. Mackail would make us eager for his versions of the *Pollio* and *Gallus*; but their beauty has only half-inspired him. Where, for instance, is the pathetic grace of the original (*Ecl.* x. 31-4) in 'Yet you will be singing, O Arcadians, to your hills of this; alone Arcadians are skilled to sing. Ah how softly then may my ashes rest, if your pipe once may tell of my loves'? Where the prolonged sigh of 'ipsae rursus concedite silvae' in 'once more, O forests, yourselves retire'? Crude too is the rendering of *Ecl.* vi. 59-60, 'Peradventure he . . . may come home on the cows' track to the yards of Gortyna;' and 'Mopsus gets Nisa' is harsh, compared to the half-resigned moodiness of 'Mopso Nisa datur.' In the

same passage, is not 'Oeta lets free the evening star' a modernism based on a beautiful passage of Coleridge? In Virgil, it is the star, not the mountain, that lives and acts. But the version of the *Georgics* is full of work like this (i. 247-51): 'There, one saith, either dead night is soundless, and the gloom thickens in night's perpetual pall, or Dawn returns from us and leads back the day; and when dayspring touches us with his panting horses' breath, there crimson Hesperus kindles his lamp at evenfall': and (ii. 468-73): 'But the peace of broad lands, caverns and living lakes, but cool pleasancess and the lowing of oxen and soft slumbers beneath the trees fail not there; there are the glades and covers of game, and youth hardly in toil and trained to simplicity, divine worship and reverend age.' It cannot, one inclines to say, be better done; it is, so far as prose allows of it, the very note of the original; so is the touch (iv. 49-50) of 'where encircling rocks echo to a stroke and fling back the phantom of a call.'

One or two lapses may be noticed. In *Ecl.* i. 26-7, the grammatical apposition of 'causa' and 'libertas' is awkwardly absent from the translation; in *Ecl.* ii. 34, the sentimental force of 'trivisse labellum' is

ignored; in *Ecl.* v. 10, 'aught of flames for Phyllis' is poor English, in the sense intended; in *Ecl.* viii. 50, 'magis' surely applies to 'improbis' as well as to 'crudelis': in *Ecl.* ix. 50, should not 'their' be 'thy'? in *G.* i. 119, 388, 'the villain goose' 'the villain raven' certainly attempts, but does not solve, the puzzle how to render 'improbis'; in 396, we doubt if 'flushed'—Wagner's interpretation—is correct; in ii. 534, 'Rome grew fairest of the world' is harsh; in iii. 285, 'circumvertamur' is not well rendered 'we pass on and on,' nor, l. 328, does 'pierce' give the full force of 'rumpent'; in the Italian summer, the thickets are not 'pierced,' but seem tingling and bursting, with the innumerable cicadas' cry; and this, no question, is Virgil's meaning. A word of praise is due to the sonnet, signed B. N., which concludes the volume; its last lines will be read with pleasure.

Virgil, our brainsick life cast to and fro,
Nature or Art too tired, too blind, to know,
Feels yet their secret in thy magic scroll;
That high-rapt calm so far remote from us
Yet not too steadfastly felicitous
Or too divinely alien to console.

E. D. A. MORSHEAD.

ZAHN ON THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons.

Von THEODOR ZAHN, D.U.O. Professor der Theologie in Leipzig. Erster Band: *Das Neue Testament vor Origenes*. Erste Hälfte. Erlangen, 1888. pp. iv. 452. Mk. 12.

It is a difficult, if not an impossible task, to write, within a reasonable compass for the *Classical Review*, either a satisfactory criticism or a satisfactory description of this extraordinary book. Not often in recent times has such a mass of well-used and mis-used learning, of sound and unsound conclusions, of reasonable and rash conjectures, and of utterly self-contradictory results, been given to the world. And it is somewhat alarming to consider that in this instalment we have perhaps scarcely a sixth of the whole: for there are to be three volumes at least, and what lies before us is only one half of the first volume. The second half is already published and will be noticed in due course: but the first half supplies more than ample material for any

one article. It has already been subjected to very severe criticism by Harnack (*Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*. Freiburg in B., 1889. pp. 112): and both Zahn and Harnack have been ably noticed by Jülicher in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of April 6th, 1889. Those who have not the time or the courage to attack Zahn's voluminous work, which with immense advantage might have been reduced to at least half its bulk, would do well to read either or both of the criticisms just mentioned. The present writer is glad to make abundant use of them for the present notice.

When there are many glaring or probable errors in a work of real merit, a criticism which calls attention to these is sure to produce an unfair impression upon the mind of the ordinary reader. And this is the effect which Harnack's pamphlet produces. His sole, or at least his main object is to point out mistakes and prevent the mischief which Zahn's learning and authority might produce. But, it may be added, there is a

rather needless severity of tone, which sometimes descends to contemptuous sarcasm or worse. Zahn is no doubt provoking enough: but it is those who have the evidence most conclusively on their own side who can afford to be serene, if not good-tempered. And here and there, as Jülicher has pointed out, Harnack is positively unfair. He not only treats his own theories as certainties, to differ from which is to fall into manifest error, and corrects Zahn where he is probably (in some cases certainly) right; but he once or twice exaggerates Zahn's language, and thus makes out a rather stronger case than exists. Thus he condemns Zahn for translating *plerique* 'some persons' (p. 73, Zahn p. 270), and *sarabara* 'mantle' (p. 87, Zahn p. 336), and for adopting the reading $\mu\eta\nu$ in Eusebius *H.E.* VI. xii. 4, instead of $\mu\eta$: and where Zahn gives certain alternatives as less probable than another, Harnack makes him reject them as in the highest degree improbable (p. 92, Zahn p. 429). But as a rule Harnack gives his readers opportunity of judging for themselves by quoting *verbatim* the sections which he is about to criticise.

The divisions of this half-volume are as follows:—Introduction (pp. i-84); 1. Old and New Testament (85-150); 2. The fourfold Gospel (150-192); 3. Other Writings of the Evangelists Luke and John (192-220); 4. The opposition to the Johannine Writings (220-262); 5. The Epistles of Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews (262-302); 6. Writings of Peter, Jude, and James (302-325); 7. The Writings afterwards excluded from the N.T. (326-368); 8. The original N.T. of the Syrian Church (369-429); 9. Retrospects and Conclusions (429-452).

The author would have saved himself from confusion and self-contradiction, and his readers from perplexity and irritation, if most of his chapters had been on the lines of the 8th. What we want to ascertain clearly is, what was the original N.T., not only in Syria, but in Asia Minor, in Rome, in North Africa, in Egypt, and in Gaul, and how soon in each case can anything which may fairly be called a N.T. be said to have existed. To these two questions ought perhaps to be added a third: What are the essential characteristics of a N.T.? It is difficult to believe that Zahn has framed for himself a clear answer to this third question, for the term 'N.T.' is used by him with extraordinary variations of meaning; and he has certainly not given his readers the answers to the other two. Harnack more than once compares Zahn's self-contradictions in this respect to the 'bladeless knife that wants a handle'; but that is not quite accurate. It is rather the case of a knife of twenty blades, of which any or all may be wanting, and yet it is still a knife of twenty blades. But probably no image would adequately represent the confusion.

A specimen of such contradictions must be given. 'At the beginning of the 2nd century the Church possessed a N.T., i.e. a collection of writings, which...like the writings of the O.T. were accounted as infallible documents of Divine revelation...This N.T. was accounted as a closed and complete whole (*ein abgeschlossenes Ganze*) too holy to be disturbed. To take away one word from it, or to add one to it, would have been an outrage.' This, he says, was the condition of things 'at Ephesus and at Rome, at Edessa and at Lyons, at Alexandria as at Carthage: and indeed it was not essentially different in the conventicles of the Montanists.' He forthwith goes on to tell us that this closed completeness was only 'ideal' (i.e. did not really exist at all), and 'had reference more to the *quality* than to the *quantity* of the collection' (which seems to mean that it was considered a monstrous thing to attempt to augment or diminish the sacred character of the books in the collection, but not at all so to turn some of them out, or put others in); and he admits that 'there existed the greatest differences as to the actual contents of the N.T., and amid the lively intercourse, which often placed the opposite parts of Christendom in most living connexion with each other, these differences were tolerated, and (one must say) almost without a word' of complaint (pp. 429, 430). These contradictory statements as to the *closed completeness* of the N.T. about A.D. 200 are contained within the compass of a single paragraph (comp. p. 150). A still more surprising contradiction as to the *purity of the text* occurs within the compass of a few lines. 'During the 2nd century the text among *catholics* and *heretics* was in the most uncontrolled manner developed, and in places wildly confused. Readers, copyists, and interpreters introduced their own conceptions of what had been handed down, their own thoughts and wishes, and even traditions from foreign sources, into the text. They did this, however, at their own peril and without general cooperation. Irenaeus was perfectly right when he claimed for the Catholic Church the *lectio sine falsificatione*' (p. 444). Thus, although among *catholics* as well as among *heretics* the text of the N.T. swarmed with

corruptions, yet, because these corruptions were introduced by individuals, and not by general consent, the Catholic Church possessed the *lectio sine falsificatione*! If so, where was it, and why were not the corrupt copies made by catholics corrected by it? It did not exist, as Zahn goes on to show; for he suggests that, when the general confusion showed scholars like Origen that it was high time to stop this wild development of discordant readings and establish a purer text, much that was genuine may have been lost through ignorance of true principles of criticism (p. 445).

In short, although in some cases Zahn's preconceived conclusions are too strong both for his learning and fairness, and he goes through thick and thin to the result which he desires, yet in other cases his knowledge and frankness get the better of his prejudices, and he admits to the full the very positions which he has been condemning. To a large extent the question between him and his opponents is one of words. Both sides maintain or admit that about the year A.D. 200 there were some Christian writings which were considered as 'Scripture'; that they were not all considered as of equal authority; that the number of them differed in different Churches; that in each Church the number increased; that in many Churches, not only were some writings, which were at first unknown or suspected, afterwards received, but some writings, which had been at first received, were afterwards rejected; that among the writings thus rejected were some of which only the names have survived, and probably others of which even the names are unknown to us; and that these independently framed collections of Christian Scriptures gradually received the name of 'New Testament.' On the one hand it is possible to talk of a Canon of the N. T. 'still in a state of flux,' of a Canon 'more or less closed,' of a Canon absolutely but only 'ideally' closed, and closed 'more as to its quality than its quantity.' On the other hand it is reasonable to maintain that a fluid Canon is no Canon at all, that a more or less closed Canon is no more a closed Canon than a more or less closed door is a closed door, that a purely ideal completeness is not a real completeness, and that as regards the Canon of the N. T. the main question is the *quantity* of the writings recognized as of authority.

It would be possible to give other specimens of the author's strange inconsistencies, caprice, and special pleading. But, after a word of protest against his fondness for

sweeping statements which cannot be established, and for exact dates where only approximations are possible, one passes on to the much more pleasant task of pointing out those portions of his work which seem to be most valuable and deserving of our gratitude. Among these are, *his abundant references to, and quotations from, primary sources, by which his readers are enabled to draw their own conclusions*; the discussion of the *Itala* (pp. 31-51); a large portion of the chapter on the fourfold Gospel; and the account of the *Shepherd of Hermas* and its relation to the Canon (pp. 327-347). The following statement respecting the *Shepherd* and similar books is worthy of consideration, especially in connexion with Zahn's main subject. It agrees badly with the contention for an absolutely closed N. T., to add to which or take away from which would be sacrilege. 'Writings, which in later centuries fell into obscurity and oblivion, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries enjoyed a far more general recognition as sacred instruments of revelation and as books for public reading in Church, and exercised a far greater influence upon ecclesiastical thought and Christian custom, than the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, or the Second Epistle of Peter' (p. 326).

Among the various hypotheses put forward by Zahn in this half-volume none is likely to attract more attention than the theory that before Tertullian's time there was no Latin Version of the N. T. So much of the best work in textual criticism, especially in England, is being done in connexion with the Latin Versions, that we may expect before long a fairly conclusive answer on this point. But Zahn's theory does not seem to be *a priori* probable. Would not the demand for a Latin Version have produced one, at any rate of the Gospels, before A.D. 200? Is it likely that at a time when the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and perhaps the work of Irenaeus against heresies, had already been translated into Latin, there was no Latin translation of any Gospel, or Epistle, or of the Apocalypse? And whence arose Tertullian's own doubts as to which Latin word least inadequately represented the *Λόγος* of St. John, if previous translations had not suggested the difficulty? But the Latin Version used by Tertullian is at present a *crux* in textual criticism, and we must be content to keep our minds in suspense respecting Zahn's somewhat startling suggestion. His arguments, however, are substantial and form a reasonable position.

A. PLUMMER.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN ATHENS DURING THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War. By L. WHIBLEY, B.A. (Prince Consort Dissertation, 1888.) Cambridge, 1889. Crown 8vo., pp. 141. 2s. 6d.

THIS essay will be found useful by English students of ancient history as furnishing them with information respecting the course of recent German research and criticism on the subject of the inner history of Athens during the Peloponnesian War. It ought, however, to have undergone careful revision both in respect to matter and style. We meet occasionally with inelegant and even ungrammatical sentences such as 'her allies had commuted the obligation to serve to tribute,' p. 108. 'These losses were aggravated by a total ruin of agriculture, a serious disturbance of trade and a rise of prices, at a time when they (*sic*) had to endure all the dangers and discomforts of a besieged city,' p. 115. 'Beloch (*Rhein. Mus.* xxxix. p. 224) thinks the total amount required for the three obol fee was about 100 talents, of which about a third came from the court fees, while from 410 onwards, for a two obol fee it was, owing to the revolt of a large number of allies, scarcely more than 33 talents,' p. 70 n. In particular, the singular pronoun of the first person should be cancelled *passim*, as its constant use gives the impression, no doubt wholly without any intention on the author's part, of exaggerated claims to originality for his statements of fact and theory. A better distribution of the material might have avoided some repetitions, such as the doublets on the tribute pp. 74, 109, on the population pp. 40, 107—wherein by the way the number of Metoec at the beginning of the war is variously stated,—and on the Strategi: in the last case indeed, as in one or two others, Mr. Whibley's doublets come very near to contradicting each other. The important subject of the constitutional and political powers and position of the Athenian generals, or Strategi, and of the relation of the *στρατηγία* to the *δημαγωγία* has not been sufficiently worked out. Mr. Whibley rightly accepts the criticism which has exploded Grote's view of the Demagogue as a 'Leader of the Opposition,' but the view which he follows—that the Generals were a sort of 'Cabinet,' and the leading General a 'Prime Minister' (c. I.

pp. 19, 20)—is scarcely less erroneous. To some extent this unfortunate analogy is corrected in c. III. p. 54, and a better parallel for a modern 'first minister' found in the Athenian who combined in one person the *στρατηγία* and the *δημαγωγία*. The good effect of this correction is, however, marred by the appearance in c. IV. pp. 121 ff. of some further utterances on the political importance of the election of generals, which are not even self-consistent. Thus, for example, on p. 121 the text states positively that 'the generals were elected by the assembly,' and the note on p. 122 admits that nine of the generals were perhaps elected each by one tribe. If an *obiter dictum* may here be ventured, I would say that we should do well to banish for a while the modern analogies which Grote introduced into the terminology of Greek history, and to content ourselves, as far as possible, with the native terms for Hellenic institutions. A second instance in which material revision of the Essay previous to publication was desirable is the treatment of the problems of the *φóρος*, pp. 72 ff. This passage appears to be founded on a somewhat confused combination of various attempts which have been made to reconstruct the history of the *φóρος*. Thus it is said: 'It has been computed that had the original members paid at first the amount which we know they did later, their contributions would not have exceeded 150 talents.' As authority for this statement 'Fränkel, n. 626, to Böckh' is cited in a note, from which reference an un-instructed reader might naturally suppose that Fränkel is responsible for the said computation. The facts are that the computation or rather one near it—for the figure should be not 150 but 154—is a computation by Kirchhoff which Fränkel in the passage cited is contravening. The passage above quoted is, however, only an inaccurate statement of Kirchhoff's theory, and this circumstance appears the more extraordinary when it is observed that on the very same page Mr. Whibley has given a particular reference to the paper in *Hermes* in which Kirchhoff discussed the question. While still on this subject and on this passage it may be further observed that Mr. Whibley's note gives a reference to Busolt 2,352, who, following Classen, regards the passage in Thucydides i. 96, as an interpolation based on Ephoros, and yet in Mr. Whibley's text the testi-

mony of Thucydides to the 460 talents is treated as virtually final. Another instance of shortcoming is to be found in Mr. Whibley's treatment of the party struggles between the Peace of Nicias and the Sicilian Expedition, and particularly in his reference to the ostracism of Hyperbolus which he dates with Beloch 417 B.C. (p. 130). Mr. Whibley is here the victim of Beloch who, when he wrote his book (including the *Excursus* on the Ostracism of Hyperbolus), was apparently unacquainted with Busolt's *Forschungen*, published years before.

On laying down the volume one cannot but

feel that as a whole the Essay might have been more homogeneous and more final in points of detail, if the author had taken time, between the award and the publication, to revise his work in the light of additional study as well of the original authorities as of modern lucubrations. With all its shortcomings it remains an interesting contribution to English historical scholarship, and if due care is taken in revising it for the second edition, which we are glad to see announced, it should prove a very useful help to young students of Athenian History.

R. W. MACAN.

Die Präpositionen bei den attischen Rednern. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Von Dr. L. LUTZ. G. Fock, Leipzig, 1887. pp. 180. 3 Mk.

DR. LUTZ is one of a number of German schoolmasters who are doing very valuable work towards placing Greek Syntax on a more scientific basis. By a laborious accumulation of statistics and a historical examination of grammatical points as they appear in the literature from the earliest to the latest times, this enthusiastic band of grammarians is producing results which must widely affect the treatment of syntax in the future. The author of this treatise on the prepositions in the orators deals with the enormous mass of materials at his command in three divisions. The first contains those prepositions which govern one case: the second those which govern two cases; and the third those which are found with all three. Each division is preceded by a table of statistics for the several prepositions about to be discussed. As his criterion of the genuineness of the speeches attributed to each of the ten orators, the author takes Blass' 'die attische Beredsamkeit,' wisely leaving alone those on which doubt is cast in that work. It may be said here that there is some danger lest the school of grammarians to which Dr. Stephan Keek, Dr. Weber, Dr. Sturm and others belong should overrate the value of this procedure by statistics. If these are regarded as anything more than material on which to base generalizations, they are likely to sink into mere arithmetical curiosities of no use to the practical scholar. In his preliminary tables, the author himself appears, by the very pains he has bestowed on them, to have overestimated to some extent the value of the method he follows. No one can read through these tables without being filled at once with admiration and with pity: admiration for the colossal labour which the author, 'working heart and soul,' has undertaken, and pity that the results he has obtained at such cost should be of comparatively small value. Those numbers which must have cost him most trouble to arrange are the very ones with which we could most easily have dispensed. For instance, what result worthy of the labour was to be gained by counting up the two thousand three hundred and eighty-six cases of *ἐκ*? In the touching preface in which Dr. Lutz dedicates his work to his wife, he tells us that he has persevered through many difficulties: the most convincing proof of this is that he has had to note over twenty-six thousand passages in order to prepare these three tables.

These are followed by a classification of the uses of each preposition under headings, with a detailed enumeration of such instances as are in any way interesting. To what extent the author enters into the minutiae may be gathered from the fact that he distinguishes twenty-one uses of *ἐκ*, sixteen of *ἐκ*. Under the latter, it should have been more clearly noted that *δεῖν ἐκ τῷ ἔξῳ* for *δεῖν ἐν τῷ ἔξῳ* occurs only in Andoc. 1, 93 (not 95, as printed). Keck has remarked this on *Clouds*, 593. Also, as far as the reviewer's observation goes, Andoc. 1, 37 is the only place in the orators in which *ἐκ* with a numeral is used of persons, though Dr. Lutz might be able to correct this. The passage is *ἐλπεῖς ἐκ τριακοσίων, ἑξὲς ἄνδρες*. There is indeed some objection to Dr. Lutz's plan of classing all the orators together under the various headings. By this method, which may have been the only one possible in a work of such small dimensions, the questions how far one orator differs from another in his use of prepositions, whether the later differ from the earlier orators and, if so, to what extent, are left unanswered. To take an instance at random, is not Andocides less strict than most in the use of some prepositions? At least it may be said that some instance of almost every use of a preposition which can be called rare in the orators will be found in Andocides. Another question which is only touched upon is how far certain prepositions are interchanged in the orators. Instances of *ὅτι* for *ὅτι*, *ἐκ* for *ἐκ*, *παρὰ* for *κατὰ* will occur to every student. Those who hold that *ἐκ* is a possible substitute for *ὅτι* in the orators to express a personal agent will note the instances collected of this supposed use with interest. They might add Andoc. 1, 78 and 79, and Lycurgus 62 to the number. But when we read the text of Pseudo-Isocrates' psephism in Andoc. 1, i.e., as restored by Droysen and Lipsius, it seems rather to tell against the assumption that *ἐκ* may be used for *ὅτι* more *Ionico*. The place is well known:—*ἡ δὲ Ἀρείου πάγον ἡ ἐκ πρυτανείου δικασθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων ἐπὶ φόνῳ τίς ἐστι φύγῃ: ἐκ* is here used of the court which gives the verdict, *ὅτι* of the president who announces it. Both this place and Andoc. 1, 79, Lys. 13, 73, Aesch. 1, 59, and Dinarch. 1, 44 appear rather to belong to the same class as [Lys.] 6, 15, *οἱ νόμοι οἱ δὲ Ἀρείου πάγου* or Andoc. 1, 36, *οἱ δὲ ἀγορᾶς ἔφευγον* (No. 2 in Lutz), and the other cases quoted in support of *ἐκ* for *ὅτι*, viz. Ant. *Isocr.* A. 8. 1, B. 6 and γ. 10, Andoc. 2, 4, Isocr. 16, 27, Hyp. 3, 23, and Lycurg. 62 may probably be compared with Andoc. 1, 65 (also no. 2 in Lutz), *Ἀνικαρτος ὁ δὲ Αἰγίρης*. But this is without

doubt open to question; and the object of these remarks is rather to show in one instance how real is the value of the greater part of Dr. Lutz's work in providing the material for forming a judgment on such points as this than to draw attention to possible errors in his classification.

Of the twenty-five instances of *σύν*, Dr. Lutz shows that Demosthenes has twelve (though this was known before his treatise). There are only two cases of the old phrase *σύν θεοῖς*, and in the majority of instances the noun is inanimate. The proper translation of *σύν* in the orators is 'along with'; the force of circumstance, as Dr. Lutz says, and not will, being the cause of connexion. *σύν* merely connects the items of a sum total. Thus an orator could say *διέφθειρον τὸν πατέρα σὺν ξυαντῇ* or *μετ' ἐλαυντοῦ* at will, but only Xenophon would have said *ἴνα ἐγὼ σὺν σοὶ ἔλθω*. There are but three cases of *ἀνά*, two in Andocides (and these two really amount to one only—1, 38) and one in Demosth. *ὑπέρ* with the accus. occurs twenty-one times, as against twelve hundred and twenty times with the gen. It is not used with accus. by Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias or Dinarchus. Lastly *πρὸς* with dat. is found in one solitary instance—viz. Isocrates, *ep.* 9, 10. It appears to be an Ionic survival, to be classed with Andocides' *ἐναυρίσθαι* and *συμφορὰ τῶν φρενῶν*.

It is impossible in this brief notice to do full justice to a work of such excellence and value. Neither is it in the power of a reviewer to test the accuracy of a tithe of Dr. Lutz's references. There is an error at p. 39, where in place of 'nur And. ii. 19, 21, und Lys. xiii, 21' for *ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ*, the author should have written 'nur And. i, 45, ii. 19' &c.; and on p. 103 in the quotation from And. 2, 4, *τῆς* is wrongly inserted before *σπαριάς*.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Bastian Dahl. Latinsk Litteratur-Historie for gymnasier og filologiske Studerende på gymnasiet af ONORATO OCCIONI, storia della letteratura latina. Kristiania, Commer Meyer, 1889. pp. xxii. + 528.

A handy and well printed manual of Latin Classic literature, from the earliest date to the end of the 5th century A.D., based upon the useful and popular hand-book of Prof. Occioni. The arrangement is practical, the criticism fair, the information well chosen, the bibliography, the most difficult and perhaps most important part of such a work, very fair on the whole. The book is 200 pages larger than Occioni's, and a great deal of time and pains have evidently been spent on it. Wisely or not, Dr. Dahl has resolved to omit the Latin patristic literature, a decision which personally one might regret. There is a good index, and the book is a delightful contrast in print and type to such manuals as Kluge's on German literature. Like Occioni's, it is worth the attention of English schoolmasters who are working higher classical forms. It would probably bear compression well, though Dr. Dahl's style is not so wordy as that of many continental writers of the kind, and flows more easily and clearly. I may conclude with the words of the later Mantuan—

*ergo comandi si cui foret ullula voia
hunc emat et faciat sicut usanza provam.*

Wanderungen durch Alt-Griechenland. Von H. W. STOLL. Leipzig: Teubner. Mk. 10.

This pleasantly-written and elegantly-printed book is an attempt to give in detail a synoptic view of the geography of ancient Greece, of the topography of its several districts, and of its cities and public buildings. It differs therefore in respect of form from the

majority of books that have been written on this subject, inasmuch as it is not a book of travels, nor a series of sketches, nor a handbook, nor a strictly scientific treatise, like Bursian's *Geographie von Griechenland*, in which authorities are given, and reasons for conclusions are assigned. It is, no doubt, somewhat discouraging to the reader to discover that the author himself has never visited Greece; nor indeed can the most careful study produce the sense of reality which is derived from ocular impressions: but this defect has in some measure been remedied by the introduction of numerous quotations from the works of trustworthy explorers, especially from E. Curtius' *Peloponnesos*, Lolling's *Griechenland* (Baedeker's Handbook), and Vischer's *Erinnerungen und Eindrücke aus Griechenland*. In other respects nothing is wanting that could make such a work complete. The historical events are noticed which are connected with the places mentioned, as well as the occupations, religious rites, and customs of their inhabitants; and local stories are worked in from Pausanias and other authorities. The vegetation and climate of the various districts are not neglected; and the influence of these, and of the physical features generally, on the character and development of the population are duly estimated. There are also numerous maps of interesting localities, and plans of sites, together with a limited number of views and ground-plans of buildings. The first volume is devoted to the Peloponnese, the second to central and northern Greece. It is the work of a man who knows his subject well, and has endeavoured to treat it in all its bearings; and though it certainly is not an amusing book to be recommended to *dilettante* readers, yet it will reward those who study it carefully.

H. F. TOZER.

Erklärung aller Mythologie aus der Annahme der Erringung des Sprachvermögens. FRANZ WERNDORFF. Berlin: Nauck, 1889.

If, being an Englishman and not knowing much about mythology, I am obliged to confess that this explanation of all mythology is quite unintelligible to me, I have at least the consolation of finding that O. Gruppe, who is a German and does know something about mythology, is apparently in the same predicament. The author starts from the unimpeachable position that when a language possesses articulate sounds for every conception it is serviceable and useful, whereas when any articulate sound can be used more or less to express any conception whatever it is in the highest degree unserviceable. He then proceeds to the more disputable statement that once in the world there was such a language as this latter, and that in the primeval period of the human race. This paves the way to what he calls the logical conclusion that, though any given articulate sound may have thrown overboard in the course of its history some of the many meanings it started with, it will in some cases at any rate retain not only its 'necessary' but also some 'unnecessary' meanings; and that the often marvellous and fantastic results of this arrested process of specialisation are what we call Mythology. The work though in German is — *ἀγροικὸς εἰμι τὴν σκάφην σκάφην λέγων* — quite worthless.

F. B. JEVONS.

The Phaedrus, Lysis and Protagoras of Plato, a new and literal translation, by J. WRIGHT, M.A. Macmillan, 1888. 4s. 6d.

We gladly welcome the reappearance in much improved form of this thoroughly Platonic translation of some of Plato's most characteristic dialogues.

The former edition appeared in the year 1848 with a short preface in which the translator expressed his obligation to the lectures on the *Phaedrus* delivered by the late Master of Trinity in 1844, and explained that his choice of these particular dialogues was determined simply by the fact that they stood first in Bekker's edition of the text. The preface has now been dropped and in its stead we find an abstract prefixed to each dialogue. So far as we have observed, no change has been made in the *Protagoras*, but the *Phaedrus* and *Lysis* have undergone careful revision both in the correction of grammatical inaccuracies, as in the *Lysis* pp. 212 and 213, and in removing any slight awkwardness of expression which could grate on the almost Tennysonian fastidiousness of the translator.

Dionysi Halicarnasensis, Antiquitatum Romanarum, quae supersunt edidit CAROLUS JACOBY. Volumen alterum. (Leipzig, Teubner. 1888.) Mk. 3.

THE first volume of this edition appeared in 1885. The entire edition will probably be completed in four volumes. This is the second edition of Dionysius' *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία* in Teubner's collection. It was preceded by Kiessling's edition, begun in 1860 and completed in 1870 in four volumes. Both editions give Reiske's pages on the margin, and this is proper, for the work of that acute Hellenist was not really superseded down to 1860. Both Kiessling and the present editor were pupils of Ritschl. Ritschl in 1838, when still in Breslau, published a critical edition of the *prooemium* and conjointly with his fellow-professor Ambrosch projected an elaborate edition of the entire history.

It was Ritschl who discerned the preeminence of two MSS, the *Urbina* and *Chisianus*. Ritschl himself on the whole preferred the latter, Kiessling the former.

The editor of the present publication, Jacoby, began his special study of Dionysius under Ritschl at Leipzig, publishing 'Observationes Criticae' in the 'Acta' of Ritschl's 'Societas Philologica Lipsiensis,' 1872.

In volumes 36-37 of the 'Philologus' Jacoby ('Die griechischen Historiker der späteren Zeit') published an elaborate *résumé* of editions of, and treatises concerned with, Dionysius, giving nearly one hundred titles. Besides Reiske and Kiessling, Ritschl and Ambrosch, Cobet and some other Dutch scholars are mentioned as critical students of D.'s text.

A paper by Sintenis (Zerbst 1856) is praised for its rare excellence.

Amongst those who studied Dionysius as the historian there have been Nitzsch, Nissen, and Peter. The latter's paper on Dionysius and Livy in *Rhein. Museum* 29 is very valuable.

The degree of familiarity with the tradition of text and study of this author acquired by Jacoby must satisfy the most exacting critics. His own preference follows that of Ritschl in extolling the codex *Chisianus*. In his treatment of the text he seems to be on the whole conservative.

Two classes of students will particularly welcome this volume, viz. those who desire familiarity with the ancient tradition of Roman History, and those who study the Atticists and desire to see how the rigorous judge of rhetoric constructed speeches himself.—Jacoby's pointing often strikes one as odd.

E. G. SIHLER.
New York.

ON AN INCIDENT IN A COAL-MINE.

"Three pit-boys, pony-drovers, might have escaped; but turned to warn their comrades, and were killed."

Σπαρτιατῶν ψυχαί. Χάρων.

Σπ. Ἡμεῖς Θερμοπύλῳσι πάλοι μέγαν ἔσχομεν αἶνον
μυρία μείναντες φῦλα τριακοῖσι·
νῦν δέ, Χάρων τίνας ἑδ' ἐπάγεις κνανόχρῳ λέμβῳ,
δόξαν ἴσῃν σχόντας τρεῖς γε τριακοῖσι;
Χα. Οἷδ' ἀσπλοὶ παιδίσκοι ἐν αἰθαλόεντι μετὰλλῳ
δεινοτέραν πολέμου πυρκαῖαν ἔμενον.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

NOTES.

HECATE.—As far as I am aware, the only explanation that has ever been offered of the name Ἑκάτη is that which is generally current and is accepted without hesitation by Roscher in his article on the goddess in his *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, p. 1899. 'Der Name Ἑκάτη selbst,' he writes, 'wird nicht von Ἑκατος, dem Beinamen des Apollon, getrennt werden können, der wiederum durch die Beinamen Ἑκάεργος, Ἑκατηβόλος, Ἑκατηβελέτης erklärt wird, so dass er wohl auf die Fernwirkung des Lichtes bezogen werden muss, u.s.w.'

This explanation has never seemed to me satisfactory. It is almost unintelligible that such an

insignificant name as 'the far one' should come into use as the name of the moon or of the sun; it is more unintelligible still that just this name should be specially applied to the moon as the goddess of the underworld. Nor does it seem likely that Ἑκάτη is merely the feminine of one of the epithets of Apollo. In point of form moreover grave doubts might be entertained whether Ἑκατη- in Ἑκατηβόλος can bear the signification which is usually attached to it. The basis meaning 'far' is ἕκα- (ἐκάς, ἐκαθεν), which suits ἐκάεργος and ἐκατηβόλος; but there are no traces of Ἑκατο- or Ἑκατη- in that sense, except in these questionable words.

It appears more likely *a priori* that the names of nature-deities should be derived from the obvious effects produced by them or from their mere appearance, than from an abstraction of the process of their operation. It is hard to believe that the name of the moon, as goddess of the underworld, connoted originally 'the operation of light from a distance.' We must rather seek for the origin of the name in the customs of Hecate-worship, as there, if anywhere, we may expect to find traces of the most ancient conception of the goddess.

Now one of the most striking customs was the ceremony called *περισκυλακισμός* (see Roscher, *Lex.* p. 1889). Young dogs were presented to Hecate at crossways, and persons who required purification were touched with them; the goddess was called *σκυλακίτις* and *φιλοσκύλαξ*; and in representations of Hecate *triformis*, she is accompanied by a dog. One might conjecture that Cerberus is merely a differentiation of Hecate, who seems to have been originally conceived in the form of a dog, as is further indicated by the statement that she was sometimes represented *κυνοκέφαλος* (Roscher, *ib.* 1909).

I would therefore suggest that the name of the goddess means *dog*. 'Εκάτη corresponds to Teutonic *hund* (Germ. *Hund*, hound), exactly as *ἐκατόν*, 100, corresponds to *hund*-red ($a = \eta = un$). The epithets of the sun *ἐκατηβόλος*, *ἐκατηβελίτης* admit of an obvious explanation. The rise of the sun slays the moon; Apollo is therefore called 'smiter of Hecate.' On the other hand the sun was conceived as the brother of the moon (Artemis) and therefore he was called Hecatus, masc. of Hecate: or may we conjecture that there were originally two dogs, Hecatus and Hecate, in magic rites, and that the former name fell out of use in this connexion, being superseded by Cerberus, and was transferred to the brother of Artemis? In later times the meaning of the name Hecate was forgotten and *ἐκατη*, naturally enough, connected with *ἐκός*. As for *ἐκάφεργος* and *ἐκηβόλος* I would suggest that they depend on the basis *ἐ(ν)η*, *ēn*, which we have in *αἰνῖς*, *κύνων*; in that case *-fergos* means 'driving off,' as in *Λυκόφεργος*.

In conclusion I would observe that the interpretation which I offer of *ἐκατηβόλος* may stand, quite independently of the explanation of 'Εκάτη, and whether the dog-theory be correct or not, it seems far more likely that these epithets had originally a precise signification such as I would attach to them than the vague meaning, 'far-darting.'

JOHN B. BURY.

* *

UNLESS Mr. Bayfield's positions on conditional sentences in his recent paper before the CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY are inadequately summarized in the last *Classical Review*, he appears not to estimate fully the *onus probandi* he assumes in his No. (1) or to apprehend exactly the bearings of the example he there cites: as a consequence, his canon fails of conviction.

In *Ion*, 354, Kreousa, though still confessedly in doubt, at this immediate point of the dialogue is manifestly sustaining the hypothesis of the boy's death: the verses from 347 show this, and *διαπαραμύνη* of 353 is her cue. To refute the accepted doctrine as to the necessary unreality of the *impf.* ind. in both members, with *ἐν* in apodosis, referring to present time, an example must be found which is less clearly bewrayed by the contest. Till then it remains that unreality in a condition means that the real state of things is contrary to what we suppose it to be—that what we suppose is contrary, not

necessarily to the actual facts, but to what we conceive the facts to be. Kreousa's use of *impf. ind.* here guarantees that she is consciously supposing a life to be continuing which at the same time she concedes to have already ended; whether that life has actually ended or not has nothing to do with her conception of it as ended. An unreal condition is contrary to assumed, not to actual, facts: just as a question expecting 'yes' for an answer depends on the facts, not actual, but assumed by the questioner, so that he would himself to this question answer 'yes': just as also, in the choice of tenses, 'the continuance is in the mind of the narrator, and has nothing to do with the absolute duration of the action.' A pure condition is the mere statement of relation: unreal conditions are not pure conditions, since they not only state the relation but also deny its actualization: just as questions expecting 'yes' or 'no' for an answer are not pure questions, but questions and answers at once.

CASKIE HARRISON.

* *

THE CODEX WITTIANUS OF THE ILIAD.—The keeper of the MSS. in the Leyden University Library has courteously sent me an extract from the catalogue of John de Witt's books, printed for the sale of October 20, 1701. The *Iliad* there catalogued (no. 2, p. 43) is beyond all doubt the Harleianus, as the description, excepting here and there a trifling change in the wording, is identical with the table of contents of our MS. a fact which Fabricius' scanty excerpt did not show. It was sold for 28 florins 10 stivers, the *Harley Odyssey* fetching 45 and the *Lucian* 34 florins.

WALTER LEAF.

* *

AESCHYLUS.—*frag.* 291, line 9.

ἀεὶ δὲ μίσει τῶνδ' ἔπ' ἄλλον εἰς τόπων.

ἀνελλήνων, ἀφελλήνων and Παλλήνης τόπων have been suggested. Read τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγῆς τόπων. It is said that the weak aorist is the commoner in Attic verse, but Aeschylus at any rate prefers the strong. See *Prom.* 469, 752; *Agam.* 327.

A. PLATT.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Orestes*.

Lines 612—13 (Kirchhoff).

καὶ τοῦδ', ὃ μύσησαιαν Αἰγίσθου λέχος
οἱ νέρτεροι θεοὶ· καὶ γὰρ ἐνθάδ' ἦν πικρόν·

Tyndareus is enlarging on Electra's guilt in stirring up Orestes against Clytemnestra. The words ὃ μύσησαιαν—θεοὶ are a report of what Electra said: and it does not seem likely that the immediately following clause is Tyndareus' own comment on them, as would naturally appear from the use of the indicative ἦν. If we read καὶ γὰρ ἐνθάδ' ΕΜΠΙΚΡΟΝ, the words may be a continuation of Electra's reported speech.

Lines 896—8.

Ἀργεῖος οὐκ Ἀργεῖος ἡναγκασμένος,
θορύβῳ τε πῆλυνος κἀμαθεὶ παρρησίᾳ
πίθανός ἐτ' αὐτοὺς περιβαλεῖν κακῶ τι.

ἡναγκασμένος is not satisfactorily explained, and even if αὐτοὺς is changed into ἀστούς, line 898 with ἐτ' is not clear.

We might read, putting a colon at the end of line 895:

Αργεῖος οὐκ Ἀργεῖος ΗΝ, ΗΙΚΑCΜΕΝΟC,
 θορύβῳ τε πῖσυνος κάμαθ' ἐπαρρησίῃ,
 πιθανὸς ΕΠΑΚΤΟΥC περιβαλεῖν κακῶ τινι.

'An Argive was he, that was not an Argive, counterfeit, confident in noise and stupid license, plausible to lead the people whither he would and cast them into evil.'

With *ἡκασμένος* in the sense of 'counterfeit' may be compared (besides Herodotus' *αἰετὸς εἰκασμένος* in iii. 28) the phrase *οὐδὲν ἐξηκασμένα* in the *Agamemnon*, 1244 (Dindorf); Euripides' own use of *εἰκασθὲν* in the *Alcestis*, 360 (Kirchhoff); and Lucian's *μισθὸν εἰκασμένου γάμου προσλαβὼν ἀληθὴ γάμον* (Herod. 6, p. 836), said of the painter Aetion, one of whose marriage-pictures won him his bride.

The generally recognised meanings of *ἐπακτός* are derived from *ἐπάγειν* in such phrases as *ἐπάγειν κίνδυνον* or *ἐπάγεσθαι ξένους*. But it may well have had a passive sense connected with *ἐπάγειν*, 'to lead by persuasion.' It is perhaps worth noticing that Hesychius has *ἐπακτοῦς ἐπηγμένους*.

In illustration of the emendation of Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 347, proposed in the July number of the *Classical Review*, might be added Pollux's *πάντα ἀνασεύσαντες κάλων* (*Onomast.* 1, 107), approved as a phrase for 'taking all advantage of a fair wind.'

ALFRED GOODWIN.

* *

EURIPIDES, *Hecuba* 612.

νύμφην τ' ἄνυμφον παρθένον τ' ἀπάρθενον.

'Versus molestus' says Nauck: and Pflugk suggests a reference to Polyxena's betrothal to Achilles. But, apart from the question of poetic merit, this was a detail of the legend which Euripides did not care to use, though there are passages where it might have been of value (cf. especially 390.) If comment is needed, Polyxena's own words (vv. 414 and 416) will supply it:—

ἀπειμι δὴ κάτω...
 ἄνυμφος ἀνυμέναιος ὣν μ' ἐχρῆν τυχεῖν.

So Jephthah's daughter laments in the *Dream of fair Women*:—

And I went mourning, 'No fair Hebrew boy
 Shall smile away my maiden blame among
 The Hebrew mothers.'

Hecabe, in ordering the preparations for her daughter's burial, by a pathetic 'irony,' contrasts the marriage rites which 'should have been her portion' with the rites that are actually in progress; the words *ὡς παῖδα...λούσω* having a twofold reference to the customary lustration of the bride before marriage and to the washing of a corpse. *ποντίας ἄλδς* in 610 is noticeable, as corresponding to the *ὑδασι ποταμίους* of Alcestis' purification (*Alc.* 159; cf. Verg. *Aen.* iv. 635.). The idea apparently is to choose water in which no taint would linger.

For the association of the ideas of marriage and death cf. *Medea* 1159-1166, with the note in Dr. Verrall's school edition; an important reference may be added to his instances of *ἀβρὸν βαίνειν*—*Iph. Aul.* 613-614 (Clytaemnestra, newly arrived at Aulis is giving directions as *νυμφαγωγὸς* to her daughter, the supposed bride of Achilles)—

σὺ δ', ὃ τέκνον μοι, λείπε παλικοὺς ὄχρους,
 ἀβρὸν τιθεῖσα κῶλον ἀσθενὲς δ' ἔμα.

A striking Biblical parallel to the lines of the *Medea* occurs in 1 Samuel xv. 32—'And Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of Death is past'—where, apart from verbal resemblance, the *ειρωφεία* of the picture is intensely Greek.

On *Medea* 957 and 963 Dr. Verrall (School ed.) discusses the nature of the *κόσμος*. To the passages quoted (*Eur. Alc.* 160, *Soph. Trach.* 764), where the *κόσμος* is distinct from the garment, add *Hecuba* 577 (of the preparations for the burial of Polyxena),

ἔστηκας, ὦ κάκιστε, τῇ νεάνιδι
 οὐ πέπλον, οὐδὲ κόσμον ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων;

In the *Hecuba* the *κόσμος* is apparently some kind of jewellery; cf. 615 foll., where Hecabe sends to collect it from the captive women,

εἴ τις τοὺς νεωστὶ δεσπότας
 λαθοῦς ἔχει τι κλέμμα τῶν αὐτῆς δόμων.

In the *Troades* 1200 foll., Hecabe similarly laments her poverty at the burial of Astyanax, and another reference to marriage rites occurs—

ἂ δ' ἐν γάμοις ἐχρῆν σε προσθέσθαι χροῖ,
 Ἀσιατίδων γήμαντα τὴν ὑπερτάτην,
 Φρύγῃα πέπλον ἀγάλματ' ἐξάπτω χροῖς
 (1218-1220).

PERCY SIMPSON.

* *

EUR. *Hec.* 595, *ἀνθρώποις δ' αἰέ*. The connecting particle is not wanted here. It seems to be only a reduplication of the *a* in a 'capital' MS., ΣΑΕΙ becoming ΣΔΑΕΙ.

F. HAVERFIELD.

* *

THUCYD. II. 96.

οὗτοι ἦσαν μέχρι Γρασίων

Probably the original reading was

ΜΕΧΡΙΔΡΡΙΑΝΩΝ

From this the Laurentian, introducing ΓΑΡ from an accidental repetition of the letters ΑΓΡ, dropping the Ι after ΠΡ, and mistaking the Ν after Α for ΑΙ, gets

ΜΕΧΡΙΓΑΡΡΡΑΙΩΝ.

With this emendation, the words Ἀγρίωνων καὶ Λαλαίων Παιδῶν are simply a recapitulation of the last sentence, Ἀγρίωνας καὶ Λαλαίους καὶ ἄλλα ὅσα ἔθνη Παιονικὰ.

S. E. WINBOLT.

* *

PLATO, *Rep.* IX. c. 10, p. 584.—This chapter offers an incidental proof not, I think, noticed by Mr. Archer-Hind of the distance separating the *Republic* from the *Timaeus*. For here it is boldly stated and unquestioningly accepted that 'there is in nature an up, down, and middle region.' In the *Timaeus* there is no part more striking to a modern reader than the clear and decisive refutation of this view with its picture of the man at our antipodes applying the words 'up' and 'down' in a sense precisely the opposite of ours (*Tim.* c. 26).

ARIST. *Eth.* IX. 4, 4.—In my note on this passage in the May No. of the *Review* I might have quoted by

way of illustration the striking language of *Theact.* 168a, 'if in all seriousness you correct men's errors they will follow you and love you, αὐτοὺς δὲ μισήσουσι καὶ φεύξονται ἀπ' ἐαυτῶν εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἢ ἄλλοι γενόμενοι (becoming new men—just as in Aristotle) ἀπαλλαγῶσι τῶν οἱ πρότερον ἦσαν (get rid of their former selves).'

J. SOLOMON.

* *

EPH. II. 20-22.—It is a sagacious observation of Lord Shaftesbury—the philosophic Earl as distinguished from the Politician and the Philanthropist—that 'the learned and elegant Apostle' St. Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, employs 'a kind of Architect-style and almost with a perpetual allusion to Building and to that Majesty, Order and Beauty of which their Temple was a Masterpiece.' By a due recognition of the allusiveness of this metaphor we may see reason to prefer a various reading which is rejected in the Revised version of the Epistle, in the text:—'being built upon the foundation (θεμελίῳ) of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner stone (ἀκρογωνία); in whom each several building fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple (ναόν) in the Lord, in whom ye also are built together for a habitation of God in the spirit.'

A peculiar feature of the great Ephesian temple, was the elevation of the platform of the colonnade and naos upon a basement—α θεμέλιον—of unusual height and spread, with an ascent of many more than the normal three steps. It was upon this that the naos was raised, of which the walls certainly were examples of that marble masonry, with all but invisible joints and beds, which was usual in fine Greek architecture. The metaphor only proceeds consistently when instead of πᾶσα οἰκοδομή we take the alternative πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή, and read 'in whom the entire structure accurately fitted growth' &c.—The word ναός is technical in Greek architecture for that division of the cella of the temple which housed the statue of the god or goddess, and thus a proper equivalent here of κατοικητήριον. One more architectural hint may be in place. The ἀκρογωνία is here the primary foundation-stone at the angle of the structure by which the architect fixes a standard for the bearings of the walls and cross-walls throughout. (Cf. Isaiah xxviii. 16.)

W. WATKISS LLOYD.

* *

SOME EPICTETEAN DIMINUTIVES.—It is worth noticing that Epictetus, Marcus Antoninus and other Stoics were in the habit of indicating their contempt for things external (τὰ ἐκτὸς) by using diminutives for things which οἱ πολλοὶ highly esteem. I have collected from Arrian some of those which are peculiar to Epictetus.

κτηρεῖδιον, little property, i. 1, 10.
αἱμάδιον, poor blood, i. 9, 33; afterwards used by Antoninus.

ἐντευξίδιον, a small petition, i. 10, 10.
σκελιδριον, a poor leg, i. 12, 24.
κορασίδιον, pretty girl, i. 18, 22. He often uses this word as well as the common form κοράσιον.
μυιδιον, a little mouse, i. 23, 4; used contemptuously of an infant. Antoninus uses the same word.
πινάκιον, a small dish, i. 19, 4. Epictetus is the only author who uses the word with this meaning.
ἀγρίδιον, a bit of land, i. 27, 16.
λεξεῖδιον, short phrase or speech, ii. 1, 30.
περιόδιον, a well-rounded sentence, ii. 1, 31.
δξιαμάτιον, petty dignity, ii. 2, 10.
NO. XXVIII. VOL. III.

ἀρπάστιον, a little hand-ball, ii. 5, 19.
οἰκοδομημάτιον, small building, ii. 15, 9. This word is due to Upton, approved by Schweighauser, for οἰκοδόμημά τι ὅν, which gives no satisfactory sense.
φυστιάτιον, small bladder, ii. 16, 10; it here means petty conceit.

ζητημάτιον, small question, ii. 16, 20; used afterwards by Libanius.

πλακούντιον, a small flat cake, ii. 16, 25.

γυμνασιδιον, little gymnasium, ii. 16, 29.

νεανισκάριον, stripling, ii. 16, 29.

γάρριον, dim of γάρον, a sauce, ii. 20, 29.

προβλημάτιον, small problem, ii. 20, 33.

δουλάριον, poor slave, ii. 21, 11. This word Epictetus uses frequently referring to male slaves, though Lucian his contemporary says any schoolboy knew that it was used in Attic only of females. See Lexiphanes, 25.

θεωρημάτιον, small theorem, ii. 21, 17.

μερίδιον, small piece of meat, ii. 22, 23. So in ii.

4, 8 μέρος means a portion of meat.

κόμιον, dim of κόμη, hair, ii. 24, 24.

τριβονάριον, mean cloak, iii. 22, 47.

πραιτωριδιον, small house, iii. 22, 47. This is

Ducange's interpretation of the word.

κουκούμιον, a small kettle, iii. 22, 71. dim. of

Latin cucuma, found in Petronius.

κραββάτιον, a small bed, iii. 22, 74.

τύλαριον, small cushion, from τύλη which seems to have been a common word, iii. 22, 74. The MSS. have τιλλάρια, which Dufresne corrected to τιτλάρια defined by Suidas δέλτος, σχεδάριον, πινακίδιον, writing-tablet. But as πινακίδια have already been mentioned, Upton following Saumaise thought that the proper reading is πιλάρια, pens, from πτελον, a feather. But Schweighauser observed that as πτελον means downy feather, πιλάρια cannot mean pens. The conjecture of Koras seems right, that the word used was τύλαρια, small cushions. He says it is still customary for boys in Greece to take them to school.

ώδάριον, short ode, iii. 23, 21; afterwards used by Longinus.

ἐπιφωνημάτιον, short conclusion or moral to a discourse, iii. 23, 31. See Quintilian, 8, 5, 11 and 11, 1, 52.

νοημάτιον, little thought, iii. 23, 31. See Quintet. 8, 5, 12.

ἀργυρωμάτιον, silver plate, iii. 26, 36. The diminutive is used in contempt.

ἐποληψίδιον, small assumption, iv. 1, 140.

μυράφιον, petty unguent, iv. 9, 7. Schweighauser changed this into μυραλείφιον without any reason; for μυράφιον is formed from μύρον as ξυράφιον from ξυρόν, a razor and νιάφιον from νιός: 'quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus.'

σνιδιον, porker, iv. 11, 11; also used by the Emperor Marcus.

νευμάτιον, small nod, iv. 13, 22.

κοχλιδιον, small snail, Manual. 7.

I cannot find νευμάτιον, νοημάτιον, πραιτωριδιον, οἰκοδομημάτιον, in my copy of L. and S.

E. J. CHINNOCK.

* *

VERGIL, *Aen.* iv. 435-6.

Extremam hanc oro veniam—miserere sororis—,
Quam mihi cum dederis cumulatam morte remittam.

May I call attention to a parallel passage which seems to me almost conclusive in favour of the above reading, with the interpretation (which I believe is Dr. Henry's):— 'This is the last boon I crave—pity a sister—, when you grant me this, I will repay it and more than repay it when I am dead.' (i.e. my

EE

manes will be *pii* towards you). In Livy xxiv. 48 we read :—'legatos miserunt qui...pollicerentur, si perseveraret urgere bello Carthaginienses, gratam eam rem fore Senatui Populoque Romano, et adiuuros ut in tempore et bene cumulatam gratiam referant.' In *tempore* corresponds to *morte* (cp. Aen. iv. 502), *referant* to *remittam* ('send back from the world beneath'),

and *gratiam* to *veniam*, a word which is more appropriate to Dido, as the boon she craves is one for which she blushes—that Anna should convey the humiliating request to Aeneas. It needs her sister's pardon as well as pity. No other passages need be adduced to prove the use of *cumulatam* for 'with interest'—

P. SANDFORD.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE ANCIENT HOME OF THE PHOENICIANS.

ON the Bahrein islands, a group off the coast of Arabia in the Persian Gulf, there is a vast necropolis of a primitive race, in which many thousands of tumuli cover an area of many square miles of what is now desert.

The results of my recent excavation of two of these mounds have brought to light several points which go far to substantiate the statements of Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny, that the Phoenicians came from these islands, and prove that the Bahrein islands must either have been their original home, or have been held sacred by this race as a place for the burial of the dead, as Kerbelā is to the Persian, or the Ganges to the Hindoo.

Firstly, as to the classical allusions. Herodotus (I. 1, VII. 89) states that the Phoenicians came from below the Euphrates, and that it was the Phoenician account of themselves, their own tradition, that owing to earthquakes, &c., they left their old home and gradually found their way to the shores of the Mediterranean. Justin (XVIII. 3) gives the same story, and so does Strabo (XVI. iii. 4, iv. 27), who calls the Bahrein islands Tyros and Arados, whereas Pliny calls the first Tylos instead of Tyros, and Ptolemy in his geography speaks of them as Tharros, Tyros or Tylos, and Arados. Curiously enough one of the islets with a village on it is still called Arad, and the identity of nomenclature with the towns of the Mediterranean Phoenicia is, to say the least of it, curious.

M. Renan sums up this classical evidence in his *Histoire des Langues Semitiques*. 'The greater number of modern critics admit it as demonstrated that the primitive abode of the Phoenicians must be placed on the Lower Euphrates, in the centre of the great commercial and maritime establishments of the Persian Gulf conformably to the unanimous witness of antiquity.'

The mounds on Bahrein, their character and their contents, localise this abode.

Secondly, the form of the tombs in these mounds with the double chamber, one over the other, is distinctly Phoenician, as is proved by the analogy of tombs at Amrit in Syria, in Sardinia, and in recent excavations on the site of Carthage. The upper chamber of the Bahrein tombs contained the *débris* of utensils, the bones of a horse, and objects presumably belonging to the deceased whose bones lay in the lower chamber wrapped in grave clothes, and with the walls, which were carefully covered in with cement, hung with drapery which in the course of ages has crumbled into fibrous dust.

Thirdly, amongst the *débris* found in the upper chambers of the tombs are numerous fragments of ivory, portions of ivory boxes, the hoof of a bull which had been fixed into a pedestal, pendants or amulets with holes bored for suspension, and some of these are covered with rude patterns which connect them distinctly with other ivory works of Phoenician provenance.

Besides these are fragments of coloured ostrich shells scratched with encircling bands, which, in conjunction with the ivories, point to a race of wide commercial enterprise, such as the Phoenicians alone were at that period.

Lastly, a few remarks on the commercial value of the Bahrein islands may serve to show the probability of these as a home for a commerce-loving race. In early days when the Oriental trade passed up the Persian Gulf, it crossed Arabia by caravan road from a spot called Gerrha, which Ptolemy places on the mainland of Arabia, just opposite Bahrein. Now big ships cannot approach this coast, and merchandise would have to be trans-shipped at the Bahrein islands and taken across to the mainland in smaller craft. The Portuguese recognised the commercial value of the Bahrein in their day. Albuquerque, in a letter to his sovereign in 1514, says that with the Bahrein and

Hormuz they would hold the keys of the Persian Gulf. Consequently they built one of their finest fortresses thereon, and always kept a strong garrison there. The terminus of the Euphrates valley railway was to have been at Koweit, just a little north of the Bahrein, and the best harbour in connection with this railway would have been there. Hence we see at different epochs of the commercial history of the world these islands have played a conspicuous part in commerce, and must have formed an excellent cradle for a race like the Phoenicians.

J. THEODORE BENT.

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.—Catalogue of Casts in the Museum of Classical Archaeology. By CHARLES WALDSTEIN, Litt. D., Ph.D., LL.D., University Reader in Classical Archaeology, and Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1889. Pp. viii, 123. 1s. 6d., large paper 5s.

THIS collection has been formed to illustrate the history of ancient sculpture; and it has therefore been restricted to reproductions of representative works. Such works have all been carefully described and discussed by the leading writers on archaeology: and, with their writings at hand, any accurate and industrious person could easily have compiled a satisfactory catalogue in the course of a few weeks. The shortcomings of this catalogue are therefore inexcusable.

In describing each cast Dr. Waldstein attempts to state where the original is now preserved. These are his statements about the first half-dozen of those originals that are now at Athens. No. 7: 'now in the National Museum at Athens.' No. 22: 'now at Athens.' No. 24: 'in the National Museum, Athens.' No. 25: 'found at Athens; now in the Central Museum there.' No. 43: 'now in the Theseion, Athens.' No. 45: 'now at the Patissia Museum, Athens.' The Museum on the Patissia Road at Athens is officially styled the Central Museum, and is popularly called the National Museum. Nos. 7, 24, 25, 45, are in this one Museum, not in three. Nos. 22, 43, are there also. No antiquities are now preserved in the Theseion.

A catalogue of casts should always state clearly what portions of the originals have been restored: for restorations are not easily recognized in a cast. In some instances Dr. Waldstein has enumerated the restorations carefully: but in others he has ignored them

altogether; and, curiously, he has almost invariably ignored them in statues that are not described in the Berlin Catalogue of Casts. In describing the so-called *Adorante*, No. 385, he says nothing about the restorations. Yet both the arms have been restored; and the accuracy of this restoration has been much discussed, as it involves the whole meaning of the statue. The original is in the Museum at Berlin, so there is no cast of it in that Museum: consequently it is not described in the Berlin Catalogue of Casts.

The inscriptions which occur on some of the statues, are of course included in the Catalogue. Dr. Waldstein quotes them all at second hand: but, singularly, he never quotes from Loewy, *Inchriften griechischer Bildhauer*, so that he would seem to be unacquainted with the standard authority on one portion of his subject. The first half-dozen inscriptions in the Catalogue may serve as examples of the rest. No. 7: 'inscribed on the base from left to right, ΑΤΕΩΟ (Ἡγήσω).' The inscription runs from right to left, and it gives a different word. The capitals are misleading, for they do not represent the archaic forms of the letters; the accent is wrong; and the brackets are ludicrous, for these have a special meaning in epigraphy. The real reading, as is well known, is ΟΜΕΩΑ = Ἀγημώ. No. 2: for ἐποίει read ἐποί(ει). No. 5: for (ἐ)κηβόλω read '(ε)κηβόλω, for φράζον read Φράζον, for μ(ήν) read μ[ήν]. No. 11: for ἀνέθ(η)κεν read ἀνέθ[η]κ[ε]ν, for τήρη read τήρη = τῇ Ἡρη. No. 26: for οὐφός(ρ)α read οὐφός[ρ]α. No. 29: for οἶν read οἶν, for χοῖ[ρ]ον read χοῖ[ρ]ον. These wanton blunders in mere copying suggest some curious reflections.

In the preface Dr. Waldstein says:—'The references have been selected on the following principle, first, if possible, a reference to some work in the English language; second, the most recent publication containing references to previous treatises; third, the best illustration.' Turn to the beginning of the Catalogue. No. 1: sole reference: 'Middleton, *Anc. Rome in 1885*, p. 374.' That is certainly an English work, though not the latest edition of it: but it gives no illustration nor references. No. 2: sole reference: 'Froehner, *Not. d. Sculpt. Ant. du M. d. Louvre*, No. 19, p. 50.' That is not an English work: it gives no illustration: and though it gives references, it was published twenty years ago, and has since been superseded. See Mitchell, *History of Ancient Sculpture*, p. 662, and illustration. In both these instances Dr. Waldstein might

at least have referred the reader to the very complete bibliographies under the corresponding numbers in the Berlin Catalogue of Casts. No. 4: no references at all. See *Proceedings of Society of Biblical Archaeology* for June, 1887, pp. 374f, plates 1, 2; also W. Wright, *Empire of the Hittites*, second edition, pp. 162f, plates 26, 27. The statement in the preface is seldom justified.

The descriptions themselves have been drawn up very carelessly; some are bald, some are diffuse, and some are nonsense. Take Nos. 61, 74, 118, 158, as examples. The introductions are beyond criticism, for it is generally impossible to comprehend the meaning.

The points remaining to be noted are: that the list of abbreviations and the index are both very incomplete: that the references to modern books are often wrong: that the quantity of minor inaccuracies is quite overwhelming: and that, according to the preface, Dr. Waldstein intends the Catalogue, not merely for the general reader, but also for students preparing for the second part of the Classical Tripos.

CECIL TORR.

CHERSONESUS CNIDIA.

THE *Χερσονήσιοι* appear in the Carian division of the Athenian tribute-lists. Their tribute, three talents, is equal to that of Cnidus. When the latter was temporarily raised to five talents, that of the Chersonesii remained stationary. They struck coins in the fifth century. These coins had on one side the Cnidian lion's head, on the other the fore-part of a bull, which appears on Cnidian coins at a much later date. The Cnidian Chersonesii dedicated at Olympia, from the spoils of war, a group consisting of three figures, Zeus between Pelops and Alpheios. Pausanias, who describes the group, calls them *Χερρόνησοι οἱ ἐν Κνίδῳ*. Aelian (*V. H.* ii. 33), referring to the same group, speaks of *Χερρόνησοι οἱ ἀπὸ Κνίδου*. We are left in doubt as to the actual wording of the inscription, which may have been in iambic verse. Who were these Cnidian Chersonesii? The district which Diodorus (*V.* 60), talking of Rhodes, rather loosely describes as *ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀντιπέραν Χερρόνησος* is the whole peninsula from Cape Crio to the Dorian Isthmus. In Steph. Byz. (*s.v.* Ἀκανθος, Σύρα) *ἡ Χερρόνησος* has the same meaning. This whole district was, Diodorus tells us, colonised by Triopas: Herodotus (*I.* 174) calls it *τὸ Τριόπιον*. The Chersonesii, who paid tribute to Athens, who struck coins, and who dedicated the group in Olympia, are usually supposed to have been the inhabitants, not of this district, but of a part of the town of Cnidus — the small rocky peninsula now known as Cavo Crio. This view rests on the authority of Pausanias alone. After describing the group in question he adds: 'The larger half of the city of Cnidus, including their most notable buildings, is on the Carian mainland. The name Chersonesus is given to an island lying off the mainland and connected with it by a bridge. The inhabitants of this island dedicated their

offering to Zeus just in the same way as the inhabitants of the quarter of Ephesus called Coressus might (make an offering in their own name, and) say that they had offered it on behalf of the whole city.' Pausanias evidently does not think that Chersonesus was ever anything but a quarter of Cnidus. Had he wished us to understand that it was once a separate city, he would not have taken the pains to impress upon us by his analogy of Ephesus and Coressus that the offering of the Chersonesii was made on behalf of all the Cnidians. He may or may not be right in his supposition that this ex-voto came from the inhabitants of the island, but in either case his testimony is against the existence of a separate city there. A phrase of Strabo's, that Cnidus is *τρόπιον τινὰ πόλιν*, expresses a physical, not a political fact. It is very improbable that this small island-quarter of Cnidus, separated from, and therefore certainly not on good terms with the town on the mainland, should by a command of the harbours, which could never have been but partial, have acquired an importance which entitled it to be rated as half of the whole town.

The right view is, I think, that of Boeckh. The Chersonesii were the inhabitants of the rest of the Chersonese, excluding Cnidus, and formed a *συντέλεια*, or more probably a permanent league.

The text of Stephanus (*s.v.* Χερρόνησος) is *πόλις ἐν τῇ κατὰ Κνίδον χερρόνησῳ καὶ τριπόλιν*. In later editions *κατὰ Τριόπιον* has been substituted for *καὶ τριπόλιν*. Here *πόλις* is the supposed independent city on the island (*Τριόπιον* is also described by Stephanus as a *πόλις*). *Τριπόλις* is the league of three cities which in the fifth century was independent of Cnidus, and which, as the following inscription shows, continued to exist as the *Κοινὸν Χερσονασιῶν* down to the time of the Rhodian dominion in Caria. The marble is among the ruins of Cedrae in the Ceramic Gulf (see *Bull. Hell.* 1886, p. 423). It is a large and heavy basis, and cannot have been conveyed from the mainland in recent times. As Cedrae is an island, and at some distance to the NE of the Dorian Isthmus, it would seem that it can scarcely at any time have belonged to the *Κοινὸν Χερσονασιῶν*. Its dialect is however Doric (see the inscriptions in the *Bulletin*). Its nearest neighbours were the Doric communities at the head of the Gulf of Doris, and, like them, it no doubt fell under the permanent and immediate influence of Rhodes. Possibly the Rhodians may have classed it with the Chersonesian cities for the purpose of government. I give the inscription from an impression. I neglected to copy it, a task rendered difficult by its position, as I thought at the time that it had been published in the *Bulletin*. The letters are ΑΜΟΦΛ, no apices, the σ, ω, and the circle of φ considerably smaller than the others.

Χερσονασιῶν τὸ Κοινόν
 Ὀνασιτέλῃ Ὀνασιστράτου νικῶντα στάδιον,
 παῖδας Ἰσθμια,
 ἀγεγέλους Νέμεα καὶ Ἀσκαπεία ἐν Κῷ,
 5 ἄνδρας Δωρεία ἐν Κνίδῳ,
]ς Διοσκούρεια,
 ἐν]δρας Ἡράκλεια,
 παῖδας καὶ ἐφήβους Τλαπολέμεια
 στάδιον καὶ διαυλον, παῖδας Δωρεία ἐν Κνίδῳ
 10 ἐφήβους Ποσειδάνια.
 στάδ]ιον καὶ ὀπλιτῶν, ἄνδρας Ἡράκλεια.
 ὀδολιχὸν ἄνδρας δις,
]φ ἀπὸ πρᾶτας ἄνδρας,
]εῖα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ δις,
 15 Διοσκούρεια δις,
 Ποσειδάνια δις,
 ΑΡΙΤΑΝΑ.

There are no more lines and all the lines are complete on the r.; ll. 1-5, 8-10, 12 and 15-16 are complete on the l. also. The illegible letters at the beginning of l. 13 may be about six in number, those in l. 14 about four. I am not sure if the space to the l. of the last line was empty or not. The inscription dates from the time of the Rhodian dominion in Caria. Four festivals—the *Τλαπολέμεια*, *Ἡράκλεια*, *Διοσκούρεια* and *Ποσειδώνεια*—have no indication of locality. We know the *Τλαπολέμεια* to be Rhodian. I presume that the three others are Rhodian also. Ll. 12-13 commemorating the victories of Onasiteles in the *δολιχόν* are not quite clear: should we read in l. 13 *ἐν Ῥόδῳ*? in l. 14 there is not room for *Ἀσκαπεία*. I think *Ἀλφεία* is probable. The existence of greater and lesser *Ἀλφεία* is doubtful; see Dittenberger, *De Sacr. Rhod.* I. p. vi.

It will serve little purpose to guess at the names of the three cities which formed the Chersonesian Tripolis. We know from Stephanus the names of three cities of the Chersonesus, Acanthus, Bybassus, and Syrna. It is a significant fact that none of these names occur separately in the tribute-lists. Diodorus, who gives a long account, evidently derived from a very tainted source, of the legends of the Chersonese, mentions, in addition to Bybassus, Cyrrnus, perhaps the same as Syrna, and Castabus. He also mentions, without giving their names, five cities, among which Bybassus and Castabus may be included, as having been founded by, and called after five Curetes from Crete. Perhaps these five Curetes only represent five names under which Zeus was worshipped in the Chersonese, cp. *Et. Mag. s.v. Εἰδωρος* (quoted by Lobeck *Aglaoph.* p. 1136), where the three Curetes, who emigrate to Caria, are three Carian forms of Zeus, of which Labrandus and Panamarus are well known to us, but *Στάλαξος* or *Πάλαξος* has still to be identified.

W. R. PATON.

THE EASTERN FRIEZE OF THE PARTHENON.—The identification of the table- and tray-carrying maidens of the eastern frieze of the Parthenon by Karl Ottfried Muller (1820) as the Athenian priestesses Kosmo and Trapezo would no doubt have been long ago as generally accepted as such happy conclusions can ever hope to be, but that he omitted to cite directly a justifying reference for Trapezo. In his chapter *De Sacerdotio Eteobutadarum* he refers, like Miss Harrison, to Harpocrator for what will not be found there—authority for the name Trapezo. This is supplied by Hesychius, *v. Τραπεζών, ἱερεῖα τῆς Ἀθήνης*. The notes give a reference to Meursius, *Att. Lect.* 187, who proposes the correction *Τραπεζώ* in accordance with analogy of *Δηώ*, &c., &c.

W. WATKISS LLOYD.

ACQUISITIONS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. A portfolio containing forty photographs illustrating Lord Savile's excavations at Nemi, and presented by him.

2. Part of a sculptured stele, giving the head of a youth wearing a tainia, from Athens.

3. Three terracotta moulds for coins of Maximinus and Licinius II.

4. a. Fragments of vases of red clay with wavy decorations in black. From Mr. Dennis' excavations in 1882 at the tumuli of Bin Tepè near Sardes.

b. Fragment of a tile stamped with monogram

ϞϞΕ
NCOC : from Sardes.

5. Wooden picture frame containing a portrait head painted on a wooden panel in encaustic. A cord for suspension is attached to the frame. From Mr. Petrie's excavations in the Fayoum.

6. A series of objects found at Mari, between Larnaca and Limassol in Cyprus: viz.

a. Sard scarab with intaglio, a winged female figure running to l.

b. Banded agate scarab with intaglio, a lion killing a deer among reeds.

c. Sard cameo, lion recumbent.

d. Jasper cameo in form of a frog: on the base are engraved Bes with two lions.

e. Haematite cylinder, the ends mounted in gold; on it are engraved a male figure, a gryphon, and other animals.

f. Gold bowl of a spoon set with garnet.

g. Silver spiral, one end mounted in gold.

h. Silver head of a ram: part of a bracelet.

i. Fragments of an inscription on talc, in late Greek.

k. Fragments of an inscription on lead, probably a *dira*.

7. a. Part of a marble stele, giving the head of a youth, from Athens.

b. Silver ring with figure of a sow in intaglio, from Rome.

c. Archaic quadriga, with charioteer, in green porcelain, from Corinth; ht. 1½ in. l. 2 in.

d. Terracotta statuette, from Beirut.

8. Two archaic slabs of white marble, found in Lydia, in excavations by Mr. G. Dennis, near the tomb of Alyattes. On each slab is carved a frieze in low relief on a sunk field in an archaic style: the one (ht. 7 in. l. 16 in.) represents three deer browsing, the other (ht. 7 in. l. 17 in.) three horsemen riding in procession to the r. armed with helmet, cuirass, and spear: the horses have large bits. The style of these slabs recalls the early Græco-Asiatic art, as we have it in the paintings from Clazomenae and the early vases with friezes of animals.

9. Seventeen terracottas and a porcelain figure of Bes, found near Beirut.

CECIL SMITH.

THE TESTIMONIAL TO SIR CHARLES NEWTON.—A meeting of subscribers to this Fund was held on October 15th at the rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society in Albemarle Street, Lord Carnarvon in the chair. The secretary reported that in all about £460 had been received, out of which, after paying for the bust, a sum of about £330 would be available for some purpose connected with the British School at Athens, which should further commemorate Sir Charles Newton's name. Lord Carnarvon made the formal presentation of the bust; it has been executed by Sir John Boehm in white marble, from a model made by that artist some time ago, but which has hitherto existed only in plaster. The trustees of the British Museum have consented to its being deposited in their keeping, and it has been set up in the centre of the Northern Gallery of the Mausoleum Room.

C. I. Gr. 2247. BRONZE VOTIVE HARE, WITH DEDICATION TO APOLLO OF PRIENE (*Gr. Inscriptions in the B.M.* Part II. No. cexxx.).—This inscription has hitherto been classed with those of Samos. That it is derived from Priene is proved by the following note written by Mr. Thomas Burgon on a drawing now in the possession of his family. The drawing was executed by the late Dean of Chichester, Mr. J. W. Burgon. 'Purchased by Cockerell, at Samos, of a Greek priest, and by C.R.C. presented to me. The Greek priest said it came from Priene, from the ruins of the Temple of Apollo.'

A. H. S.

Revue Archéologique. May—June 1889. Paris.

1. Waille: the bearded head from Cherehell, which de Villefosse thought was Oceanus, is rather Prometheus, and probably decorated the palace of Juba: two plates. 2. Perrot: note on the Graf collection of painted mummy portraits for sale in Paris: two plates. 3. Deloche: rings and seals of the Merovingian period, continued: twelve cuts. 4. S. Reinach: the Gauls in ancient art, concluded: description of Greek and Italian bas-reliefs: most of these belong to the Pergamene cycle; but it must be borne in mind that there must have existed monuments recording the previous defeat of the Gauls in B.C. 279. The Ammendola sarcophagus does not depict an episode of Roman history, but was inspired by a Hellenistic painting representing the defeat of the Gauls by Asiatic Greeks. The representations of Gauls are owed to two principle sources: the Delphic, of which we know almost nothing: and the Pergamene, which we know in part: the Galati became in art the type of Barbarian *par excellence*; six cuts. 5. Drouin: the era of Yezdegerd and the Persian calendar, continued. 6. Blanchet: ancient tesserae, theatrical and otherwise, continued: descriptive list, with cuts. 7. Guillemaud: Gaulish inscriptions: a new attempt at their interpretation, continued. 8. De Kersers: the monuments of the Department of Cher, continued: history of Architecture in the Department. News. Bibliography. Review of epigraphical works relating to Roman antiquity, by M. Cagnat. C. S.

Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. April 1889. Athens and Paris.

1. Bérard: an archaic inscription found by him in the excavations of Dec. 1888 at Tegea: the first 35 lines are almost complete, and are a regulation of the temple of Athene Alea, dealing with the rights of pasturage in the fields of the goddess, the punishments for various offences, the sale of the sacred produce &c. 2. Doublet: twenty-eight Greek inscriptions from various sites in Paphlagonia. 3. Lechat: two sarcophagi of the Constantinople Museum: the first (badly given in *Arch. Zeit.* 1858 pl. C) has the subject of Hippolytus and Phaedra, and that of Theseus abandoning Ariadne: the second (from Tripoli) also represents Hippolytus and Phaedra: two plates. 4. Cousin and Diehl: three inscriptions of Cibyra (?) and five from Eriza (?). 5. Radet and Paris: two inscriptions from Amorgos, recording hypothecae: the first is that of a married woman, security furnished by the father to his son-in-law for the payment of the remainder of the dowry: the second is security for a loan. 6. Foucart: Attic inscriptions: (i) dedication of the prytaneis of the tribe Pandionis: (ii) treaty of alliance between Coreyra and Athens in 375 B.C. Inscriptions from a sepulchral chamber in Rhodes. 7. Durrbach: three inscriptions, from Oenoë, Pagae, and Aegosthenes. C. S.

The same. May 1889. Athens and Paris.

1 S. Reinach: antiquities discovered at the theatre of Delos in 1882: four inscriptions, one of which records the name of an Athenian dramatist hitherto unknown, Dionysios son of Demetrios: and part of a terminal statue of Hermes, covered with graffiti, consisting of rough sketches and inscriptions: the work of passers-by, but showing true Greek skill and observation of nature: two plates and a cut. 2. Fougères: twenty-five Greek inscriptions collected in Thessaly during a tour in 1887. 3. Jamot: boundary inscription of the territories of Kopai and Akraiphia. 4. Homolle: decrees of the Athenian

population in Delos. 5. Durrbach: five Greek inscriptions from Imbros. 6. Foucart: a study of the Athenian decree of B.C. 352 found at Eleusis, relating to the sacred domain, on the borders of Attika and Megaris, called the *ἱερὰ ὄρυς*: this was published in the *Ep. 'Apx.* 1888, p. 25. 7. Lechat: a marble relief of the latter part of the sixth cent. B.C., of which the two fragments were found at different times on the Akropolis at Athens: it represents Hermes playing flutes, followed by a dancing group, composed of the three Charites and a youthful figure: this last M. Lechat thinks is either an initiated mortal or some unknown hero connected with the cult. C. S.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1889, part 1. Athens.

1. Winter: publishes the fragment of the Sophilos vase (Klein, *Meist.* p. 217) with three other fragments of it which have since been found: a fourth fragment, which probably belongs, is given in Bendorff, *Gr. u. Sic. Vas.* xi. 5. The subject is the bringing of the Dionysos child to the Nysaeon nymphs: the treatment resembles closely the Peleus scene on the François vase, though the drawing of Sophilos is not so fine—evidently Sophilos had the François vase before his eyes to borrow from. Perhaps both Klitias and Sophilos had a model, probably of Korinthian origin: plate. 2. Michaelis: the so-called tripod capital of Eleusis: the inner Propylon at Eleusis had formerly two Ionic columns standing in front of the antae. Lenormant's excavation in 1860 brought to light two capitals, which Bötticher considered to be tripod bearers; an examination of the marks on the upper surface, however, shows that they carried the corners of an epistylon. This must have belonged to the building of Appian Claudius, as is also clear for stylistic reasons: two cuts. 3. Pomtow: in 1887 was found at Delphi an inscribed marble base; it contained three inscriptions, viz. (i) a verse of ten elegiacs which Pausanias (x. 9, 5) has rendered in prose; it states that 'the dedication was erected by the Arkadians from the booty they had won from Lacedaemon': this must refer to the events of B.C. 370. The dedication consisted of a group of statues—Apollo, Nike, and the Panarkadian race-heroes: on historical grounds it must have been put in hand in February, 369. Pausanias names the four sculptors of the group; he probably had never seen the original, but merely copied the description from a catalogue of the Delphian dedications, perhaps that of Polemon. (ii) and (iii) are proxenia decrees which give new facts of the chronology of about B.C. 230; they were inscribed on this Arkadian base because they were in honour of Arkadians: a parallel case is that of the Messenian records on the base of Paenios. 4. Winnefeld: alabaster with representations of negroes: a number of these are known. Heydemann thought them a fabric of Lower Italy; two here published prove them to belong to the time of early Attic r.f. painting, shortly after the Persian Wars: the early style survived for this particular class of vases: two cuts. 5. Wolters: ten Greek inscriptions from Thessaly: the first is a decree of the *Κοῦρον τῶν Μαγνητῶν* (cf. *Bull. de Corr.* xiii. p. 271). 6. Dörpfeld: the original site of the choregic monument of Nikias is settled by the remains of a foundation wall N.E. of the theatre of Herodes: it was similar to the Thrasylos monument, but had two side façades as well as a front façade: when the theatre was built, part of the monument was destroyed. Its materials were built into the so-called 'door of Beulé,' the date of which is thus fixed. 7. Brueckner: poros sculptures from the Akropolis: (i) the pediment with the group of Typhon: from a detailed examination of

the early sculptures he demonstrates that one pediment contained the contests of Zeus and Typhon, Herakles and Echidna, and that the other pediment of the same building contained the contest of Herakles and Triton. Of the first pedimental composition he gives a suggested restoration. Of the three bodies of Typhon, the central one shows signs of being by a different artist from the maker of its companions; there is the same difference in the heads of Zeus and Herakles: two photographic plates and a 'Beilage.' 8. Kontoleon: seventy-two Greek inscriptions from different sites of Asia Minor. 9. Wolters: boundary stone of a temenos of Athene at Aegina.

Dörpfeld's report on the excavations on the Akropolis. Wolters' report on recent finds at Athens, Eleusis, and Mykenae; and a note of Kontoleon about recent discoveries at Pergamon. Reports of meetings.

C. S.

The same. 1889, part 2. Athens.

1. Szanto: on Attic inscriptions: (i) a contract of lease, inscribed on a fragment of pottery: (ii) on the psephisma concerning the people of Tenedos. 2. Blümmner: scenes of handicraft: vase painting of a potter's workshop with a curious representation of the punishment of a slave: fragment of vase with a similar scene: and a marble stele from Larissa with a carpenter using an adze: three cuts. 3. Treu: two female statues wearing cuirasses in the National Museum at Athens were considered by Gurlitt and others to be representations of towns or landscapes: he explains them as the Iliad and Odysseus personified; the statues were probably copied from types of the period of the Diadochi: two plates, three cuts. 4. Ramsay: Syro-Cappadocian monuments in Asia Minor: 'under this term I include the class of monuments which are commonly called Hittite': discusses Hirschfeld's proposed line of demarcation between these and the Phrygian monuments: plate, ten cuts. 5. Mordtmann: five Greek inscriptions from Salonia and Thessaly. 6. Conze: on the so-called Venus Genetrix: publishes a sketch of a marble statuette not included in S. Reinach's list (*Gaz. Arch.* 1887, p. 250): a statuette from Pergamon: and a fragment from Mykonos. Reinach's No. 38 does not belong to this type, but is a votive figure: plate, three cuts. 7. Koldewey: criticizes Pomtow's view as to his own restoration of the hall of the Athenians at Delphi. 8. Demitsas: nine inscriptions from Amisos and the neighbourhood. 9. Zerkentes: two inscriptions from Syros and Naxos. 10. Wolters: preliminary account of the recent discoveries of Mycenaean antiquities at Amyklæe.

C. S.

Revue Numismatique. Troisième trimestre, 1889. E. Drouin. 'Essai de déchiffrement des monnaies à légendes araméennes de la Charracène' (concluded). —Th. Reinach. 'Les monnaies arsacides et l'origine du calendrier juif.'—E. Babelon. 'Quelques remarques sur les monnaies d'Afrique et d'Espagne.' On coins of the king of Numidia. Disputes Zobel's attribution (cp. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 4) of various African coins to Spain. *Chronique.*—'Petit bronze inédit de Claude le gothique.'—*Reviews.* Head's 'Catalogue of Coins of Corinth' in *Brit. Mus.*, by E. Babelon].

W. W.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. May—June, 1889.

A. de Belfort. 'Recherche des monnaies impériales romaines non décrites dans l'ouvrage de H. Cohen.'

(continued). Describes coins of Constantius Chlorus, Helena, Maximianus II., Severus II.—

July—August, 1889.

A. de Belfort. 'Recherche des monn. imp.' &c. (continued). Describes coins of Maximinus Daza, Maxentius, Alexander, Licinius I. and II., Valens, Martinianus.—E. Taillebois. 'Une monnaie inédite [de la Gaule] en électrum à la légende *Germanus Indetillil.*' W. W.

Numismatic Chronicle. Parts 1 and 2, 1889.

Arthur J. Evans.—'The "Horsemen" of Tarentum.' An important monograph on the coins of Tarentum, occupying pp. 1—228, dealing chiefly with the types and chronological arrangement of the horsemen series. Illustrated by 11 autotype plates.—B. V. Head. 'Notanda et corrigenda.' 1. N or M on Athenian coins. Th. Reinach has proposed to assign certain classes of Athenian tetradrachms inscribed N—a letter indicating according to him the thirteenth Prytany—to the period B.C. 255—200 when the number of Athenian tribes was thirteen. Head conclusively shows that these coins must on grounds of style be later than B.C. 200 and maintains that N is an engraver's blunder for M (M = 12th Prytany). 2. Two misread coins of Ephesus (a) Trajan. (b) Antoninus Pius. The inscription accompanying a figure of Apollo is shown to be ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΙΚΕΣΙΟΣ and not ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΕΜΒΑΣΙΟΣ. 3. Philadelphia Lydiae. The coin of Caligula attributed by Head (*Num. Chron.* 1888 p. 300) to Philadelphia and Germanicopolis in Cilicia is now assigned to Philadelphia in Lydia. 4. Lydian gold coinage.

W. W.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik (Berlin). Bd. xvi. Heft 3—4, 1889.

L. Brunn. 'Coins of Tyras of the time of Hadrian.'—K. F. Kinch. 'The language of the Sicilian Elymi.' Mainly on the well-known inscriptions ΣΕΓΕΣΤΑΙΒΕΜΙ, ΕΡΥΚΑΙΒ &c. on coins of Segesta and Eryx. They are considered to be due to the Elymi the native inhabitants of the neighbourhood. B = Ε. ΣΕΓΕΣΤΑΙΒΕΜΙ = Σεγεσταίη = Σεγεσταίη εἰρή, the inscription referring to the head of the nymph Segesta on the coins. J. N. Svoronos. 'Constellations as coin-types.' Deals with the coins of Mallus in Cilicia. The reverse-type of the earlier coins—a conical stone accompanied, at first, by two objects resembling both birds and bunches of grapes, and, afterwards, by bunches of grapes—is most ingeniously explained as a representation of the baitylos of Zeus (= the constellation of the Bull) accompanied by the constellation of the Peliades (the 'Doves') which was also known as Βότρυς (Bunch of Grapes). The symbols ▽ and Γ which sometimes take the place of the dove-grapes are explained as symbols of the constellations Hyades and Delatton. The various winged figures on the coins are explained as Iris, Eosphoros (figure carrying disk ornamented with star), Boreas (double-headed winged figure carrying disk) and Zephyrus (winged male figure with disk).—Th. Mommsen. 'Gold bars from Sirmium.' (*Cp. Class. Rev.* III. pp. 142, 186, 381).

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 18 May, review of E. Hatch's 'Essays in Biblical Greek,' 'Notes from Mt. Athos,' by J. P. Mahaffy. 25 May, rev. of Workman's 'Text of Jeremiah in the Greek and Hebrew.' 22 June, letter from Sp. P. Lambros on the 'MSS. of Mt. Athos.' 29 June, notice of Mackail's transl. of the 'Eclogues and Georgics.' 13 July, rev. of Stevenson's 'Dict. of Roman Coins.' 27 July, notices of Noeldechen's 'Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians'; C. de Boor's 'Neue Fragmente des Papias'; R. Handmann's 'Das Hebräerevangelium'; A. Harnack's 'Die Akten des Karpus, des Papyrus, u. der Agathonike.' 24 Aug., rev. of Chagnat's 'La Rhétorique et son histoire.' 7 Sept., rev. of Withrow's 'Catacombs in Rome,' and of M. Mayer 'die Giganten u. Titanen in den antiken Sagen u. Kunst.' 21 Sept., rev. of Key's 'Latin Dict.' 5 Oct., rev. of Lightfoot's 'Essays on Supernatural Religion' and Reply.

Academy: 18 May, notices of Whibley's 'Political Parties in Athens during the Peloponnesian War'; L. Holtzapfel's 'Beitrage zur Griechischen Geschichte'; Néronstos Bey, 'L'Ancienne Alexandrie'; L. Ménard's 'Histoire des Grecs'; C. Hude's 'Commentarii critici ad Thucydidem pertinentes'; E. B. Birks, letter on 'Zeus = Serapis in Inscriptions.' 25 May, F. Haverfield, rev. of Leaf's 'Iliad II.'; van Leeuwen and da Costa's 'Iliad'; Monro's 'Iliad II.'; Maass 'Scholia Townleyana.' 1 June, J. S. Mackay, rev. of Allman's 'Greek Geometry from Thales to Euclid.' D. B. Monro writes an obituary of H. W. Chandler. 8 June, V. Balzani, rev. of Tunison's 'Master Virgil'; C. Oman, rev. Stevenson's 'Dict. of Roman Coins'; notices of Lewis' 'New School Latin Dict.'; Dymes' 'Selections from Lucretius'; B. D. Turner's 'Republic X.'; Shuckburgh's 'Herodotus VI.'; Dimsdale's 'Livy XXII.'; W. S. Hadley's 'Hippolytus'; W. C. Compton's 'Caesar, B.G. VII.' J. Cook Wilson writes on 'Mr. Archer Hind's last word.' 22 June, Roby, review of W. G. Hales' 'The Cum Constructions'; Haverfield, rev. of Earwaker's 'Recent Discoveries of Roman Remains in Chester'; notices of Stewart's transl. of Seneca on Benefits; Shilleto's 'Plutarch's Morals'; Stock's 'Meno of Plato'; J. O. Smith's 'Die Psychologie der Stoa'; H. Siebeck's 'Untersuchungen zur Philosophie der Griechen'; Freudenthal, 'Über die Theologie des Xenophanes'; T. W. Allen, letter on the Venice Athenaeus; I. Taylor, the verb substantive in Etruscan. 6 July, W. Victor, letter on Virgil in the Middle Ages. 13 July, notice of S. Hemphill's 'The Diatessaron of Tatian.' 20 July, notices of Liddell and Scott's 'Intermediate Lexicon'; Duff's 'Lucretius V.'; Bayfield's 'Ion.' 27 July, T. W. Allen, letter on the Ravenna Aristophanes. 3 Aug., notices of R. Handmann's 'Das Hebräer Evangelium,' and E. Schwartz 'Tatiani oratio ad Graecos.' 10 Aug., notices of A. N. Janaris on Eratocritus and its author; J. Schmitt, 'Die Chronik von Morea'; N. B. Phardys, 'History of the Greek colony in Corsica'; J. S. Tunison, letter on Virgil in the Middle Ages. 17 Aug., H. J. White, letter on the Coire and St. Gall fragments of the old Latin version of the Gospels. 14 Sept., E. S. Roberts, letter on the Inscriptions from Naukratis. 21 Sept., Bp. Lightfoot, letter on the Muratorian fragment [It was originally written in

Greek verse and reconstruction of some lines. Date after about A.D. 185 or 190.]; C. Oman, rev. of Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Greek Coins—Corinth. 28 Sept., letter on Muratorian fragment by author of 'Supernatural Religion.' 5 Oct., Sayce rev. Gilmore's fragments of the Persika of Ktesias. 12 Oct., H. Nettleship rev. Ellis' Catullus, 2nd. ed. 19 Oct., Rob. Ellis, rev. of Owen's 'Tristia of Ovid.'

The Expositor. Nos. 54-57 (June to Sept. 1889).

No. 54. A. Jessopp on the allusions to primitive liturgies or confessions of faith which may be found in the New Testament. The Dean of Armagh on the Minor Apostles. Josiah Gilbert on Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the Image and the Stone. G. T. Stokes on St. Columbanus and his Library. A. B. Bruce continues his comments on the Ep. to the Hebrews in this and the following numbers.

55. C. Plummer illustrates the documentary theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels by a comparison of the earliest authorities on the story of Becket. F. Rendall writes in this and the following number on St Paul and the Galatian Judaizers. Obituary of the Rev. W. H. Simcox.

56. G. T. Stokes on St Columbanus and his teaching.

57. Dean of Armagh on Judas Iscariot. Joseph B. Mayor on St James I 17, II. 1, III. 6. E. G. King on St. Paul's method of quotation (criticizing Bartlett's Bampton Lectures).

Hermes, vol. xxiv. part 2.

1. A. Reuter, *Der Codex Bernensis 363 und sein Werth für die Kritik des Chirius Fortunatianus.*

2. C. Hülsen, *Die Abfassungszeit der capitolinischen Fasten.* A discussion based on the measurements and probable position of certain newly-discovered fragments of the *Fasti Capitolini*, as to their date, whether 718 A.U.C., as held by Borghesi and Mommsen, or 742 as held by Hirschfeld. Hülsen decides in favour of the former. The *Fasti* were engraved on the Regia when restored after its destruction by fire in 718, by Cn. Domitius Calvinus.

3. Th. Mommsen, *Das römische Militärwesen seit Diocletian.* A very important article of which the main points only can be summarized. After prefacing that the frontier-system of Augustus was both enlarged and supplemented by a regular field-army, and that the military unit was now the numerus, Mommsen treats successively of (1) *Die Grenzbesatzungen.* From the time of Constantine the frontier-troops became distinctly soldiers of the second class, milites ripenses or limitanei, as opposed to the imperial field-army developed out of the Praetorian guard (milites palatini or comitatenses). The soldiers stationed in the various castra (castriciarii or castellani) round the staff-encampments (fossata) were essentially peasants, with certain territories assigned to them which, like the towns, were the subjects of legal rights, were free from taxes, hereditary, like the military service itself, and inalienable. Cavalry and infantry were now entirely distinct, the former being divided into cunei equitum, equites and alae, the latter into legiones, auxilia and cohortes. A table of the frontier-troops, as far as legions are concerned, is given by means of the list dating from M. Aurelius (C.I.L. vi. 3492) and the Notitia Dignitatum of the

reign of Honorius. The old legions, *i.e.* all those mentioned in Dio Cassius 55, 24, still contained 6000 men, though they were usually divided into detachments of 1000 men each. The new legions contained only 1000 men. The auxilia of which there were 44 are only found in the Danube provinces. They ranked higher than the legions, and were of barbarian formation. Indeed in this epoch the further troops are removed from Roman nationality and formation, the higher they are ranked. These auxilia were probably developed out of the numeri of prae-Dioletian times, and the importance of the Illyrian local-militia explains why the auxilia are only found in these parts. The cohortes resemble those of the Augustan organization. The *cunei equitum* and *equites* both ranked above the legions, the former being probably of barbarian formation, the latter Roman. Comparison between the prae-Dioletian and Constantinian is only possible in the case of the legions. Excepting Britain, Africa, and Germany, of which we have no information, we find 17 new legions against 23 old ones. This however does probably not represent the real increase by Dioletian, for we find in the east 20 and in the west 18 legions described as pseudo-comitatenses. These were probably at first frontier-troops, and were then promoted perhaps by Constantine into the imperial field-army. This would agree with the statement of Lactantius that Dioletian quadrupled the number of troops, and also with that of Zosimus that Constantine increased the field-army at the expense of the frontiers. With regard to the command, the *legatus pr. pr.* was supplanted by the *dux limitis*, military and civil functions being differentiated, while the Augustan *legatus legionis* became after Gallienus the non-senatorial *praefectus legionis*, and after Dioletian the old legion were divided into several detachments, each of which (as a virtual unit) was commanded by a *praefectus*, while after Constantine the title *praefectus legionis* occurs in no document except the *Notitia*, probably drawn up after an old and obsolete arrangement, and each division was henceforward commanded by its tribune. (2) *Die Föderirten der Grenze*. These were a development of the Augustan system of client-states, over which Roman influence, but not Roman organization, extended. But in post-Dioletian times the clientela was essentially modified, for (a) the federated states usually gave protection rather than received it, and (b) the Roman government paid for the protection it received. In connection with the latter point, the institution of *foederati* was a convenient cloak for what was really the buying off of an enemy's attack, as when Justinian paid annually 500 lbs. of gold to the Persians. The *foederati* were in a sense Roman soldiers, but paid by the own kings. (3) *Die scholae*. These were the first division of the imperial field-army; they were instituted by Constantine, and so called from waiting for orders in a hall in the palace. They were always the most efficient soldiers procurable, now Germans, now Armenians, now Isaurians. There were only about twelve of them, each 500 strong. (4) *Die Palatini und die Comitatuses*. The Palatini were instituted by Dioletian, to emancipate himself from the military and political traditions of the Praetorian guard. They were attached, not to the capital, but to the person of the emperor. They consisted of 24 vexillationes of cavalry, 25 legions and 108 auxilia. They were distributed both in the east and west, and were as a rule, though not actually in the capitals, yet more or less in their vicinity, and at any rate immediately under the disposal of the *magistri militum* residing there. The Comitatuses were differentiated from the Palatini probably by Constantine, and formed an additional number

of troops at the emperor's free disposal. As a rule, they were stationed further from the capitals in the provinces, as a reserve for frontier defence. The auxilia of the Palatini were light-infantry troops of non-Roman formation probably developed out of the practice of Maximian who formed corps which he sent into all parts of the empire out of the local militia of various German tribes. In the post-Dioletian epoch they formed the flower of the Roman army. (5) *Die bucellarii*. These (from *bucella*, the military bread) were a sort of retainers who followed officers to the wars, but were always free-men. They belonged in fact to a developed condottier-system. So Theodoric was only the leader of a German horde taken into Roman pay, and the Thracian Belisarius was the condottiere of a mercenary troop. (6) *Die Rechtsgründe des Kriegsdienstes*. Non-citizens, *i.e.* barbarian troops, were now ranked higher than citizens who are found still in the legions, but not in the vexillationes, or auxilia, or scholae. The grounds of military-service are (a) voluntary enlistment, (b) provision of recruits by landed proprietors who sent their coloni in lieu of land-tax, (c) hereditary military service, (d) barbarians were after Dioletian often settled within the empire or on the frontiers with lands assigned to them on condition of military service. These were either *laeti* or *gentiles*. (7) *Das Gesamttheer, und das Commando*. A calculation, based on the *Notitia*, would show that the frontier troops, legions, auxilia and cohorts (excluding Gaul, Britain and Africa) amounted to 360,000, the imperial field-army to 194,500. The chief command was by Dioletian retained in the hands of the *praefectus praetorio*. Constantine gave that of the infantry to a *magister peditum*, that of the cavalry to a *magister equitum*. These were more directly concerned with the field-army, but had an indirect control over the limitanei. (8) *Übersicht der in den Clientelstaaten oder im Ausland gebildeten Truppenkörper*.

4. F. Leo, *Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Alterthums*. Since the investigations of Westphal, the metrical tradition of antiquity has fallen into two systems, a younger and an older, one referring the sum-total of verse-forms to a larger number of fundamental verse-forming metres, the other deriving all forms from the two most prominent, the heroic hexameter and the iambic. Whether one of these systems is a modification of the other, can be discovered only by an historical survey, and this is briefly here attempted.

5. H. Diels, *Reiskii Animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem*. The five volumes *Animadversionum* in *Graecos auctores*, published during Reiske's life-time, were so neglected that the remainder of his MSS. were never used. This was a great mortification to Reiske who said 'Ich bin gewiss, so verachtet sie jetzt sind, so wenig ihr Werth erkannt wird, so wird man sie doch einmal suchen und ihnen Gerechtigkeit widerfahren lassen, wann Neid, Partheilichkeit und Affecten todt sein werden.' Towards the fulfilment of this prophecy Diels here takes the first step, having secured the use of Reiske's manuscript *Animadversiones* in *Laertium Diogenem* from the Library at Copenhagen. He finds that in many points the editions of Huebner and Cobet might have gained from a use of these notes which contain 'multa nova et palmaria.' Diels adds: 'Omnino haec postuma sic edenda nobis putabamus ut non grammatici diligentiam nocentem illam saepenumero scriptorum famae, sed filii erga parentem pietatem praestaremus. Sic enim caste sancteque parentasse videbimur Reiskii magnis nec satis placatis manibus.'

6. A. Wilhelm, *Altische Psephismen*, supplementary to those described in vol. xxiv. part 1.

Hermes, vol. xxiv. part 3.

1. Dessau, *Ueber Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. An important and interesting article to prove that these biographies are probably later in date than Constantine, and are the work of the same hand. (1) Of the four authors of the lives up to Gordian III., Spartianus and Capitolinus dedicate some to Diocletian, some to Constantine, but it is extremely unlikely that the same author would dedicate to both, while unusual apostrophes are made to them in the course of the history, without any flattery or any allusion to their exploits. (2) The lives from Philippus to Claudius Gothicus, usually attributed to Trebellius Pollio, appear to be written in the time of Constantius Chlorus, and before he was Augustus, yet after the building of the *Thermae Diocletianae*, i.e. about 305. But the supposed descent of Constantius from Claudius is continually mentioned, though it is extremely unlikely that Constantius would have encouraged any such allusions while Diocletian was Augustus, and in fact the Gallic Panegyrics are completely silent on the point. This supposed descent from Claudius was almost certainly an invention of Constantine's reign. (3) Vopiscus in his life of Aurelian speaks of Constantius as still living, and of Diocletian as a private person, i.e. it purports to be written 305-306, but the mention of Constantius is a sort of prophecy of the future greatness of his house, and this could not have been published at Rome at so early a date. (4) All six writers give many false accounts, especially in those reigns or lives where the acquisition of information would be difficult. In all of them too are traces of events belonging not only to the first third of the fourth century but to a later time still. These traces occur principally in proper names. Thus Capitolinus (vit. Maxim. 27, 6) gives many details about the son of the emperor (he calls him Maximinus, though his real name, as we know from coins, was Maximus), many of them unlikely and all of them unnoticed by other historians. Among them he states that he married a certain Junia Fadilla, who afterwards married a senator named Toxotius. Now such Graecised names for Roman senators never occurred in the third century; but in the second half of the fourth two Toxotii, both Roman senators, lived, and probably the author has transferred their names to fill up gaps in his history. (5) Other names also mentioned amid improbable circumstances and certainly belonging to the last years of the fourth century occur, e.g. that of Ragonius Celsus (vit. Pesc. Nig. 3, 9, conf. C.I.L. vi. 1759 &c.) that of Faltonius Probus (vit. Aur. 40: conf. C.I.L. vi. 1185) that of Clodius Celsinus (vit. Clod. Alb. 12, 9, 11: conf. C.I.L. ix. 1576 &c.). (6) A striking point is the prophecy that the descendants of Probus would be 'tantae in senatu claritudinis ut omnes summis honoribus fungentur' (vit. Prob. 24). To have written this before the prophecy was fulfilled would be pointless. It was amply fulfilled by the family of Petronius Probus, but in this case could not have been written earlier than 370 A.D. at least. (7) The statement that Maximin was the son of a Goth and an Alanian (vit. Max. 1, 5) could hardly have originated earlier than the end of the fourth century when Goths and Alani did dwell together in Thrace. (8) Certain verbal similarities between the scriptores on the one hand and Eutropius and Victor on the other have usually been explained by supposing that the latter copied from the former. But a comparison of their mode of dealing with Suetonius, who was certainly their authority for the first century, does not support this view, and it is more probable that the scriptores made use of Eutropius and Victor.

In several passages too they blame certain 'imperi scriptores' for statements which are found only in Eutropius and Victor. From all this it would appear that these biographies were written at the end of the fourth century, but in order to gain them greater credit, various touches were given to them to make them appear to date from the beginning of the century. But it would be a curious coincidence if six authors all pursued this course. Were they really six, or only one? To enable this question to be answered, a number of similarities between these six reputed authors in subject, treatment, phraseology, manner of quotation, habitual playing upon proper names, and other points are given, which lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the same author composed all the lives, and hit upon the device of attributing them to different authors and an earlier epoch, in order to make his work more popular.

2. Th. Mommsen, *Die älteste Handschrift der Chronik des Hieronymus*. An account of the MS. of Hieronymus recently found in the Bodleian Library. It belonged to the Meermann collection, in which catalogue it is numbered 770. The MS. contains the chronicles of Hieronymus and Marcellinus Comes, but of the former the earlier portion is missing, so that the MS. actually begins with the year 555 ab Abr. The MS., written in uncials, and belonging, according to Maunde Thompson, to the earlier part of the sixth century, is singularly correct in orthography, and must take the premier place as an authority for the text. It agrees in many points with M, the Middlehill MS. now at Berlin, which ranks second in value, and also shows a striking affinity to F, a MS. of the ninth century, but copied from an archetype of the early sixth. Thus OM are free from the mistakes of APBF: while OF are free from those of APBM. Several of the readings in O have a more than textual interest. Thus the bad government in Illyricum is in O ascribed to Probus 'praefectus Illyrici,' in the other MSS. to 'Equitius Illyrici comes,' the fact being that Probus, though no doubt credited with the guilt by Hieronymus, who wrote in the east, was too powerful for the western copyists to venture on naming him, and they therefore substituted the less formidable Equitius.

3. E. Bethe, *Untersuchungen an Diodors Inselbuch*. Diodorus in Book V. mentions as his authorities for the treatment of Crete, Epimenides, Dosiades, Socrates and Aglaosthenes (C. Robert's conjecture for Laosthenides). Bethe discusses this and comes to the conclusion that though Diodorus may have used an old Theogony of Epimenides, his main authority for Crete was Apollodorus' Commentary to the *κατάλογος νῆων*, which Strabo, between whom and Diodorus numerous resemblances are pointed out, also used. But whether Apollodorus was used directly or mediately through other authors, does not admit of so easy an answer. The various questions connected with this subject are discussed with much minuteness.

4. A. Nauck, *Analecta Critica*. A series of critical notes on passages from Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, Theocritus, Lysias, Plutarch, &c. &c.

5. I. Vahlen, *Varia*: in continuation to vol. xvii. 595 seqq.

Miscellen: A. Skias, *Zum Gesetz von Gortyn*.—V. Jernstedt, *Zu Sueton*. (1) In Jul. Caes. 28 defends the common reading 'quando nec plebiscito' in opposition to Mommsen's suggestion 'ei' and Hirschfeld's 'lege.' (2) In Tib. 29 opposes Hirschfeld's insertion of 'semper' before 'senatus servare,' and remedies the passage by alterations in punctuation. —J. Beloch, *Die Sklavenzahl Boeotiens im fünften Jahrhundert*.

Göttingische gelehrte Anzeiger, 1889:—

No. 1, Jan. 1. Duncker, Max, *Abhandlungen aus der griechischen Geschichte* (Niese). Composed of seven articles which have already appeared separately. 1. Lands of the Spartans. 2. Strategy and military tactics of Miltiades at Marathon. 4. Treason of Themistocles. An attempt at the vindication of Themistocles. Also, incidentally, a discussion of Pausanias' conduct. 5. The peace of Cimon. By far the best article in the collection. 6. On a supposed law of Pericles. The question at issue is the requirements of Athenian citizenship, as mentioned by Plutarch, *Pericl.* 37. 7. Pericles' voyage to Pontus. Placed in 444 B.C.

No. 5, Feb. 15. Egenolff, *Die orthopischen Stücke der byzantinischen Literatur* (F. Blass). Excellent work considering the scanty material at hand. The review is chiefly on matters of detail.—*Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta* ed. Theo. Kock. Novae Comœdiæ fragmenta, pars. III. *Comicorum incertae actatis fragmenta*. *Fragmenta incertorum poetarum*. Indices. Supplementa (O. Crusius). This is the last volume of the *Fragmenta*, and is on a par with Kock's other work. A great deal of new matter has been brought to light, especially in the part devoted to *Fragmenta incertorum poetarum*. The certain and the uncertain, however, are not sufficiently distinguished. Kock depends more upon his 'griechisches Gefühl' than upon the notices of the grammarians. He would have done better to consider such Byzantines as Apostolios and Macarios.—Hartmann, J. J., *Analecta Xenophontea* (R. Mücke). Learned, brilliant, but one-sided.

No. 8, Apr. 1. *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. XVI. *Poetae christiani minores*, pt. I. Paulini Petricordiae carmina, rec. M. Petschenig. Orientii carmina, rec. R. Ellis. Paulini Pellaei Eucharistica, rec. G. Brandes. Claudii Marii Victoris Alethia et Probae certo, rec. C. Schenkl (Missowa). Brandes' work is the most satisfactory, although the work of the whole book is very good. The critical treatment of the first part is something entirely new.—*Old Latin Biblical Texts*. I. Ed. by John Wordsworth. II. Ed. by John Wordsworth, W. Sanday, and H. J. White. III. Ed. by H. J. White (under the direction of the Bishop of Salisbury) (Corssen). Good as a whole, but in some respects unsatisfactory and incomplete.

No. 9, Apr. 15. Billfinger (G.), *Die antiken Stundenangaben* (Matz). The principal point made is that such phrases as *hora sexta*, &c., mean 12 o'clock, &c., and not 11–12, &c.

No. 10, May 1. De Boor (C.), *Vita Euthymii: ein Anekdote zur Geschichte Leos des Weisen* (Gülicher). Two parts to the work. The first part consists of the newly-discovered *Vita*. The second part contains a consideration of the chronological and historical worth of the *Vita* for the years between 880 and 920. The work is well done and satisfactory.

No. 11, May 15. Krüger, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des römischen Rechts* (Bremer). The book is divided into three periods. 1. Royal and Republican times. 2. Time of Emperors to Diocletian. 3. Time from Constantine to Justinian. The first period should extend to the Punic Wars. The line between the second and third periods, as well as that between the Republic and the Empire, is questionable. The third period more naturally commences with Hadrian. Jurisprudence is too much of a simple theory to the author. Some account should have been taken of history.

No. 14, July 1. Baumgärtner (P.), *Die Einheit des Hermas-Buchs*. Link (Ad.), *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermas* (Jülicher). Link upholds the unity, Baumgärtner does not. There is much that is sug-

gestive in Baumgärtner's book, but Link's contains the better arguments and is better executed.

No. 15, July 15. *Liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*. Ex unico codice Vaticano denuo editit Th. E. ab Sicking (Steindorff). With Preface and Prolegomena. By a master hand. Col. I dates from before 680, Col. II. from before 795. Col. I., composed of smaller collections, put in this shape for easy memorizing. Later Col. II. was incorporated. Consideration of Vatican MS. of *Diurnus* is no inconsiderable part of the work.

No. 16, Aug. 1. Soltan (Wilhelm, Dr. phil.), *Die römischen Amtsjahre auf ihren natürlichen Zeitwert reducirt* (Matz). The author has greatly lessened the value of his work by refusing to see that the old-Roman data do not correspond to the Julian data. The criticism deals mostly with details.

Blätter für das Bayer. Gymnasialschulwesen, Bd. 25. 1889.

Heft. I. Essays:—A. Steinberger, *Goethe und die Alkestisfrage*, explains how essentially the *Alkestis* of Goethe differs from that of Euripides.—A. Zucker, in *Caes. Bell. Gall.* vi. 7, 6, proposes *consulto* for *in consilio*.—Zehetmayr, *Sincerus* und *Sanskrit*, connects *sincerus* with the Sanskrit form *saṃ-kīra*, and gives various meanings and the etymology of the latter.

Reviews:—F. Curschmann, *Horatiana* (Proschberger). Recommended to all students of Horace.—A. Holder, *Avieni Carmina* (C. Weyman). Contains a list of MSS. and editions and 250 titles in an index *librorum Avienum illustrantium*; also a complete index *verborum*.—J. H. Schmalz, *Krebs Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*, 6. Aufl. (J. Gerstenecker). Reviewer gives extended criticism of details, but says that the book is indispensable for special students of Latin.—C. W. J. Cron, *Platon's Gorgias*, 4 Aufl. (Baumann). Greatly changed from third edition, less in text than in notes, which are improved and corrected. Many points are reviewed in detail.—A. Hotop, *De Eustathii Proverbis* (E. Kurz). New results are not numerous. Not a full survey of the material; confined to the commentaries on *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, and these not exhausted. Many proverbs improperly admitted and others excluded. Additional sources which might be used are added by Kurz.—O. Bie, *Die Museen in der Antiken Art* (H. L. Ulrichs). An extended though not exhaustive study of the representations of the Muses in antique art.—M. Duncker, *Abhandlungen aus der griechischen Geschichte* (H. Welzhofer). The essential contents of these are in his history. Too little attention given to the newest literature. The reviewer discusses the statement of Plutarch in regard to Lycurgus' division of the land, as it is presented in the essay, *Ueber die Hufen der Spartaner*.

Heften 2 u. 3. Essays:—M. Kiderlin, in *Quintilian*, v. 7, 18, proposes *primo sparsa* for *sparsa*; in 19, *manifestum fiat* for *manifestum sit*; in 21, *est ars actoris* for *est oratoris* of the MSS., and *est accusatoris* or *actoris* according to the conjecture of some.—C. Weyman, in support of the correctness of the tautological expression *δίκη δικάλα*, Soph. *Antigone*, 23, brings forward *δίκη γὰρ δικάλα ἐστίν* found in A. Harnack's edition of *Akten des Karpus, Papyrus, und der Agathonike* § 8.—Baumann, in Plato's *Protagoras*, 315^c proposes to remove the asyndeton between *ἔθορα* and *ἀκούσαι* by the insertion of Δ ; in 325^c to remove *τῷ θανάτῳ* and take *πρὸς* as an adverb.

Reviews:—A. Kiessling, *Horatius Satiren* (J. Proschberger). Chief value consists in the rich collection of passages from the Greek and Latin which had influence upon the author. Valuable treatment of the persons and relations alluded to in Horace.

Not so successful in the lexical and grammatical portions. Reviewer criticises the edition in a long list of passages.—H. J. Müller, *L. Annaei Senecae oratorum et rhetorum sententiae divisiones colores* (A. Köhler). Represents essential progress in the reproduction of the original text. Reviewer closes with the critical consideration of several passages.—E. Kammer, *Kritisch-ästhetische Untersuchungen, betreffend die Gesänge MNEO der Ilias* (M. Leibel). Editor shows that the books M-O together form one group, but were not originally constituent parts of the poem. Reviewer agrees in the main with the results of the next part, which gives a critical discussion of those portions of M-O which agree with other verses of *Iliad* or portions of *Odyssey*. At the close is a thorough analysis of book M, some of the details of which the reviewer discusses.—N. Wecklein, *Sophocles Aias*, 2. Aufl. Does not differ essentially from 1 ed.—C. Schwenker, *Sophokles Tragödien*, vol. 6 (K. Metzger). Shows marks of haste in preparation.—L. v. Sybel, *Platons Symposion* (J. Nussner). Writer calls it the dedicatory writing of the Platonic Academy. Work is not clear and arrives at no results. The other parts, *Die Metapher* and *Die neue Poesie* are better.—J. Sommerbrodt, *Lucianus*, vol. i. part 1. (T. Preger). No one better fitted to furnish a new edition. Changes in text good, and show fine feeling for the language of Lucian. It is to be regretted that he has not examined the relations of the MSS. of each writing by itself. The materials in regard to the MSS. are not entirely reliable.—J. R. S. Sterrett, *An Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor, and The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*. A brief descriptive outline is given of these papers which 'belong to the most important epigraphical publications of recent times.'—F. Krebs, *Zur Redaction der Casus in der späteren historischen Gräcität*, 1 u. 2 Heft (K. Krumbacher).—W. Schneidawind, *Ueber den Akkusativ des Inhaltes bei den hervorragenden griech. Prosaikern* (J. Sturm). Some new and important points of view for the further treatment of the question.—H. Fritzsche, *Kurzfassete griechische Schulgrammatik*, Part II. Syntax (J. Haas). Rules are concise and sometimes too short for clearness, and the illustrative examples are brief and instructive.—V. Duruy, *Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs*, Lief. 37-63 (3.). They contain the close of the rule of Hadrian and the time of Antoninus and Marcus Aurelius.—Iwan Müller, *Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. IV. 1. *Die griechischen Altertümer*. 1. G. Busolt, *Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer*. Author is limited somewhat by the character of the handbook. Reliable lists of literature valuable for special study. Reviewer adds a long list of books which have been omitted or have appeared since the publication of the work, and closes with corrections.—O. Schulthess, *Vormundschaft nach attischem Recht* (J. Melber). Has treated all the questions pertaining to the subject and noticed the literature bearing on it, giving the passages from the Attic orators mostly in full. Often a lack of clearness in the presentation.—O. Keller, *Tiere des klassischen Altertums in kulturgeschichtlicher Beziehung* (L. Dittmeyer). Writer is admirably fitted for the work by the examination of Greek and Roman classics and also by the study of Greek, Roman, Assyrian, Egyptian and Persian reliefs, statues, coins, gems and vases, both in published works and in the museums. Some common animals have been omitted. Credit is deserved for identifying some names of animals.—F. W. Schubert, *Atlas Antiquus*. It would have been better and more correct if the accompanying text had been omitted.—An extended biography of H. W. Heerwagen by A. Westermayer. Heft 4. Essays:—F. Vogel, *De Diodoro Siculo*,

replies to H. v. Herwerden's criticisms upon his edition of Diodorus.—H. Stadtmüller, *Zur Kritik der Iphigenia Aulidensis des Euripides* (v. 1011-1030).—Reviews:—F. Schoell, *Plauti Rudens* (Weissenhorn). Brings us nearer the desired goal of a complete text of Plautus which shall satisfy modern demands, by the aid of a most exact collation of important MSS. and of the text emendations of learned men.—W. Klouček, *Vergil*, Part 1, *Bucolica et Georgica*; ed. major and ed. minor (H. Kern). The larger edition is carefully supplied with critical apparatus. The smaller is adapted to school use.—M. Wohlrab, *Platons Euthyphron*, 3. Aufl. (J. Nussner). Shows an important improvement in the introduction in his changed view in regard to the object of the dialogue. Many changes in the text, to some of which reviewer objects.—C. de Boor, *Theophylacti historia* (K. Krumbacher). Reviewer compares Theophylact with his three predecessors, Procopius, Agathias and Menander. Editor has made a thorough study of the MSS. and declares Vaticanus 977 saec. xi-xii to be the archetype; has furnished a really new and purified text. Valuable index of subjects and also of words.—G. Wendt, *Griechische Schulgrammatik*. A good book for the gymnasia. Two excellences—concrete examples of the most common constructions almost from the beginning of the book and tabular views giving much information.—Iwan Müller, *Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. IV. 2. *Römischen Altertümer*, H. Schiller, 1. *Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer*, 2. *Kriegsaltertümer*; M. Voigt, 3. *Privataltertümer und Kulturgeschichte* (M. Rottmann). Schiller was perhaps compelled by the character of the work to treat some of the subjects too briefly. The chapters on the Empire are excellent. Voigt shows wonderful learning and ability to put things well.

Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1889.

No. 1. Meier and Schömann, *Der attische Process*, neu bearb. v. Lipsius. Plan and arrangement are the same as in the old edition, but in each case the results of recent investigations are carefully given.—Maschke, *Die Freiheitsprocess im klassischen Alterthum*, insbesondere der Process um Virginia. M. claims that in Greek law there existed along with a 'vindictio in servitute' a 'vindictio in libertatem.'—*Carmenis Saliaris rell.* ed. Lander. Shows clearly that a satisfactory restoration of the C. S. is impossible. The ingenuity of L.'s emendations is seen in the following specimen:—O Zaul, adortese omnia!! Vero^m ad patla cōmēts es !! iāneus Iānes, &c.=O Sol oriens invade omnia! portarum ad patulos aditus comis es ianitor, Iane, &c.

No. 2. Hoffmann, *De mixtis graecae linguae dialectis*. H. claims a mixture of different tribes and their dialects, in opposition to Collitz's 'wave-theory.'—Hoerschelmann, *Eia griech. Lehrbuch der Metrik*. Supplement to H.'s edition of the so-called Hephaestion scholia B. He constructs out of the extant material a compendium composed in the Byzantine time which was differently treated by different editors.

No. 3. Wheeler, *Analogy and the scope of its application in language*. Without giving new material Wheeler endeavours—often successfully—to group facts which are already known.—Veckenstedt, *Geschichte der griech. Farbenlehre*. Die Farbenunterscheidungsvermögen. Die Farbenbezeichnungen der griech. Epiker von Homer bis Quintus Smyrnaeus. The third part is the most satisfactory. V. has wasted too much time in refuting the views of the 'eye-Darwinists' (Glaistone, Geiger, Magnus, &c.).—Hertz, *De Vergiliū Maronis grammatici epitom. cod.*

Ambienensi. Deals with a MS. overlooked by Hueme. This MS., now in Amiens, contains the epitome and seems to go back to the same source as Hueme's two MSS.

No. 4. Aars, *Das Gedicht des Simonides in Platon's Protagoras.* In arranging the fragments Aars follows Hartung. The textual criticism shows nothing of importance.—Holzapfel, *Beitr. z. griech. Geschichte.* Discusses the time of Solon's laws, the relations between Athens and Persia between 465–412, and the chronology of the beginning of the Peloponnesian war.

No. 5. Tümpel, *Die Athiopienländer des Andromedamythos.* The myth of Andromeda was transferred to the Orient during the sea-voyages and colonisations of the Rhodians; its scene was originally the isle of Rhodes. With *Αἰθιοπία* is meant in early time *Ῥόδος* and with *Αἰγυπτός* the island of *Κύπρος*. But the author's view can hardly be regarded as satisfactorily proved.

No. 6. *Arriani τῶν μετ' Ἀλέξανδρον libri VII. frag. e cod. Vat. reser.* ed. Reitzenstein. A revised edition of the fragments discovered by R. in Vat. gr. 495, and published in his *Habilitationschrift*.

No. 7. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period.* It is to be regretted that this useful book has not been more thoroughly revised and improved. The *Συναγωγή λέξεων ἀθηναίων* by Kumanudis would have yielded hundreds of new words.—C. Schumacher, *De Republica Rhodiornum.* Deals with the time from 304–171 B.C. A noteworthy discussion of inscript. in *Bull. de corresp. hell.* viii. 358.

No. 8. *T. Livii ab urbe cond. libri apparat. crit.* ad. ed. Luchs, vol. iii. lib. xxi–xxv. Contains a complete list of var. lect.

No. 9. Peterson, *In Galeni de placitis Hippocratis et Platonis libros quæst. crit.* Relation of MSS.; variae lect. of cod. H.; investigation of the law of hiatus in Galen; finally a number of emendations and conjectures (p. 405, 7 M. *ταπεινός* for *καλὸν* τὰ πτώσεις p. 469, 4 M. *δοτεῖον* for *αἷον*).—Tolkiehn, *Question. ad Herodotum Ovid. spect.* cap. vii. Endeavours to show that of the Heroides 1–14, nos. 3, 8, 12, 13, 14 are genuine.

No. 10. Kurtz, *Miscellen zu Plutarch's Vitæ und Apophthegmata.* Cat. min. 61 *τελωνικῶν* for *πρωτικῶν*. Caes 54. τῆς <σῆς> *σπηλιάς*. Arat. 49 *ἀνδρόνομα*. Sull. 14. οἱ *προσβῦται*. The second part contains critical and exegetical remarks on Plutarch's Apophth. which will prove useful to an editor.—*Ἀδάμπος*, *Πλουτάρχεια ἀπανθίσματα ἐν Ἀγιορειτικῇ κώδικι τῆς μονῆς Διονυσίου*. From the specimen given it seems that the extracts from Plutarch in cod. Ath. mon. Dion. no. 90 (saec. xiii.) are of no importance for textual criticism.

No. 11. *Declamatio in Lucium Sergium Catilinam.* Eine Schuldeclamation aus der röm. Kaiserzeit nach einer Münchner Hs. des xv. Jh. hrsg. v. Lümmer. Besides the cod. Monac. a Leyden MS., saec. xv. (containing only 5 chap.), is used. The text is entirely renovated.

No. 12. Deecke, *Die Falisker*, gesch.-sprachl. Untersucht. Deals with the geography, history, culture and language of the people. The most important part of the book is the collection and explanation of inscriptions.—Ruze, *Quæstiones Strabonianæ.* The periplus used by Strabo for his description of the Iberian peninsula is attributed to Posidonius, in opposition to iii. 3, 4 and Zimmermann. The second part deals with the sources of books xvi. and xvii.—Sauer, *Der Anfänge der statuarischen Gruppe.* Treats the archaic period separately—an unhappy thought. His divisions can hardly be maintained.

No. 13. *Corpusculum poesis graecae ludibundae*, fasc. I. ed. Brandt. Contains parodies (in the modern sense of the word) of the Homeric poems. B. goes frequently too far and sees epic fragments where there are only reminiscences (cp. Wilamowitz's criticism of the 7th chapter in his recent Göttinger Programm). The edition contains most valuable suggestions and emendations.—Jacob, *Horaz und seine Freunde.* 2 Aufl. hrsg. v. Hertz. This new edition of J.'s useful book will certainly find many readers.

No. 14. *Denkmäler des klassischen Alterthums.* . . . hrsg. v. Baumeister. Deserves warm commendation although various points are open to criticism. Julius' articles especially seem meagre and his views partly antiquated and one-sided.—Halbherr e Orsi, *Antichità dell' antro di Zeus Ideo in Creta.* Most interesting collection of antiquities (going back to the 8th century B.C.) excavated by H. and Aeraki).

No. 15. Hiller, *Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der griech. Bukoliker.* Contains edition of *Θεοκρίτου Διόσκουροι*, *Ηρακλείς*, *Μεγάρα*, *Θεοκρίτου Βουκολικός*, *Ἀλκίς*, *Κηριοκλέπτης*, *Ἀδώνιος ἐπιτάφιος*, *εἰς νεκρὸν Ἀδωνιν*, *Ἐρασθῆς*, *Ἐπιθαλάμιος Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Δηιδάμειας*, with investigation of the value and relation of the various MSS. *Ηρακλείς* (Theoc. 25) and *Μεγάρα* (Mosch. iv.) are attributed to the same author.—*Glossae latino-graecae et graeco-latinae* ed. Goetz et Gudermann. According to Goetz's essay (*Transact. Sacron. Acad.*) all glosses without any alteration or emendation, as they are found in the MSS., will be collected in a corpus glossarium. Afterwards a corpus glossarium which contains an alphabetical list and emendations is to follow. The present volume contains: *Philoxenus'* and *Cyrrillus'* glossaries, and five smaller ones (among those the so-called *idiomata* and *Glossae Servii*) and glossae *nomina*.

No. 16. Danielson, *Grammatische und etymologische Studien*, I. Upsala Univ. Arsskrift, 1888. Deals with *κάρα* and *κέρπος*, which go back to a root *ker-*, akin perhaps to *aker-* (*ἀκρος*).—Viereck, *Sermo Graecus, quo senatus populusque Rom. . . usque ad Tiberii Caes. aetat. in scrip. publ. usi sunt.* The text of the inscriptions contains many emendations of both the author and his teacher Wilamowitz. The statistics of p. 55 ff. are useful though meagre.—Neumann, *Griech. Geschichtsschreiber u. Geschichtsquellen im xii. Jahrh.* Contains a good deal of new and valuable information.

No. 17. Martin, *Les Cavaliers Athéniens.* This exceedingly interesting and instructive book contains: I. The origins; II. Knights and religious festivals of Athens; III. Organisation of the body of Knights; IV. Knights in the society of Athens; V. Aristocratical party at Athens.—*P. Ovidius Naso ex Merkelii recogn.* ed. Ehwald, I. Contains happy emendations, frequently by change of punctuation (as *Her. xiv. 78*); *Am. II. 5, 5 depressae* for *deceptae*, *Her. xv. 113 malis* for *multis*, &c. The editor follows often too slavishly the two Parisian MSS.

No. 18. *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* . . . hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. Hefenbände V.–VII., VIII.–X., XI., XII.–XIII. 'Very satisfactory in every respect.'

No. 19. *Dionysi Halicarn. Ant. Rom.* ed. Jacoby. Collation of Urbinae (B 105). Happy conjectures but various misprints.—Mollweide, *Ueber die Glossen zu Sallust.* Glosses of six Munich and one Einsiedel MSS. Of no great importance for textual criticism.

No. 20. *Commentationes philologicae*, quibus Ottoni Ribbeckio . . . congratulatur discip. Lipsiensis.—Crusius, *Stesichoros u. d. epod. Compos. i. d. griech. Lyrik.* Misinterpretation of a winged word of the comedy has led to the belief that Stesichoros invented strophe, antistrophe and epode.—Zielinski, *Die*

- Schlacht bei Cirta u. die Chronologie v. 203-202.* 'June 24th, 202 is the date of battle.'—Opitz, *Quaest. critt. in Senecae et Quintiliani declam.* 'among others: contr. VII. 4, *epistulam luctuosam* for *infructuosum*, Quint. decl. p. 6, 20 R. *praecipitem* for *praecipue*.—Graf, *Plutarchisches*.—Immisch, *Xenophon über Theognis u. d. Problem d. Adels.* 'Aristotle's *περί εὐγενείας* and Xenophon on Theognis are genuine.'—Schmidt, *De Ulixis in fabb. satyr. pers.*—Marcelli *Sidetae medici frgg.* rec. Schneider.—Wagner, *De Apollodori bibl. interpolat.* 'against Hercher's interpolation-theory.'—Schulze, *De Ag. etymol. ap. orat. Attic. usu.*—Matthias, *Emend. in L. Annaei Senecae op.*—Hanssen, *Quaestiuncula pseudanacreontica*.—Kramholz, *Quaest. Clesianae*, 'date of Cyrus' birth as given by Ct. is an intentional mis-statement; he was born before 433.'—Freericks, *Eine Neuerung d. Sophocles*, defends the old explanation of *δράμα πρὸς δῶμα ἀγωνίζεσθαι*: that on each of the three days one play of each poet was performed.—Buresch, *Die Quellen zu den vorhandenen Berichten v. d. Catilinar. Verschwörung*.—Hildebrandt, *Beitrag z. Deutung d. Gorgonen*. 'They are names of Athena as goddess of the sea.'—Bapp, *Beitr. z. Quellenkritik d. Athenaeus*. 'Two chief sources are Pamphilus's alphabetical lexicon and Seleucus (time of Tiberius) on ancient drinking bouts.'—E. Zarncke, *Der Einfluss der griech. Literatur auf die Entwicklung d. röm. Prosa*.—Ilberg, *De Galeni vocum Hippocrat. glossario*.—Sternbach, *Gnomica*.—Schroedler, *de reb. Martinensium*.—Scheidemantel, *De IV., VIII., IX. primi lib. Tibull. eleg.*—Holland, *De Alpheo et Arethusa*. 'Anthol. Pal. IX. 362 refers to Stilicho's victory in 396, composed perhaps by Musaeus.'—Cichorius, *Ueber Varro's libb. de saeculis originibus*.—Heinze, *Animadverss. in Varronis rer. rustic. librum*.—Weber, *De Philomone Atheniensis glossographo*.—Poland, *De Graecor. sollemnib. ex regg. diadochor. et epigonor. nomin. appell.*—Nowack, *De Isocratis, περί τοῦ ζεύγους oratione (xvi.) et Lysiae κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου priore (xiv.) quaest.*, claims genuineness of Isocrates' oration.—Ruge, *Quaest. Artemidoreae*. § 8-14 of Agathemer's Compendium go back to Eratosthenes; § 15-19 to Artemidor.
- No. 21. *Xenophontis. Commentarii*, rec. W. Gilbert. Valuable discussion of the genuineness of the Memorabilia, with reference to Krohn's and Hartmann's recent works. The text follows Cobet, Dindorf, Schenkl, without giving new MS. material.—T. *Livei ab urbe cond.* ed. Zingerle p. I. libb. 1-5. A new MS. of St. Paul in Carinthia collated, with but few good readings.
- No. 22. *Diodori bibl. hist.* rec. Vogel, I. The text is much improved by the use of Vindobon. 79 (D). Unfortunately the author had no time to collate also the best MSS. of class II. of which he uses chiefly Vatic. 130 (C) and Clairmont I (F).—Ericus Pernice, *Galeni de ponderibus et mensuris testimonia*. Valuable supplement to Hultsch, *Metrol. scrip. coll.* I. 209.
- No. 23. Egenoff, *Die orthographischen Stücke der byzantinischen Litteratur*. Critical investigation of texts neglected by Lenz's Herodian.—Ioannes Charax epit. Herod. Orthograph., Timotheus of Gaza, *κάνονες καθόλου περί συντάξεως*, &c. Contains also a collection of the passages of ancient authors bearing on the pronunciation of the letters of the Greek alphabet.
- No. 24. Schwarz, *De vita et scriptis Iuliani imperatoris*. Besides 1, 24, 66, 72, 75, letters 31, 40, 41, 53, 60, 61, 67, 8, 19, 25, 32, 54, 68, 73 are regarded as not genuine, almost exclusively on grounds of style and language.—Q. Horatius Flaccus ekl. v. Kiessling, III. The commentary deserves the highest praise. Only a few conjectures in the text.
- No. 25. M. Rothstein, *Quaestiones Lucianae*. 'There existed a collection A of the most famous works, a collection B of mostly rhetorical works and declamations, and D, the four collections of minor dialogues. The archetype of the first class contained A with D inserted between Prometheus and Menippus, and B. The archetype of class II. contained B, A and C (containing a number of writings not in A and archetype of class I.) but not D.' Mann's theory that the Vindobonensis and Mutinensis are copied from the MS. of Archbishop Arethas is shown to be wrong.
- No. 26. Gomperz, *Ueber die Charaktere Theophrasts*. 'Characters genuine. Preface, definitions and clausulae of 1, 3, 6, 8, 28, 29 interpolated. Is a collection of material.' This does not seem to settle the question satisfactorily.—Schultess, *Annacana studia*. Of 80 conjectures only 8 can be regarded as probable.
- No. 27. *Scholia Graeca in Homer. Iliad. Townleyana* rec. Masss. The editor has executed his laborious task very satisfactorily.—Alfred Gudeman, *De Heroide Ovidii cod. Planudeo quae supersunt*. (Berl. Stud.) 'Planudes' cod. comes from the same source as the two extant MSS. (cf. *N. Philol. Rundschau*, 1889, p. 100).
- No. 28. *Theophylacti Simocattae historiae*, ed. De Boor. The text is based on cod. Vatic. gr. 977, apparently the indirect archetype of the other MSS. A very useful index graecitatis is added.—Schnorr v. Carolsfeld, *Ueber die Reden u. Briefe bei Sallust*. 'The cod. Vatic. is incomplete, because it contains no speech of men like Sertorius and Lucullus, while in Jugurtha and Catilina, those who stand in the foreground deliver orations. Moreover, hist. fr. v. 14, 15, point to an oration of Gabinius. If that be granted each book contains two orations.' A gradually increasing skill in the speeches is also claimed by C. Many points are open to criticism.
- No. 29. Gustav Bilfinger, *Die antiken Stundenangaben, 'hora sexta' does not mean the sixth hour, but "at six o'clock."*—M. Hertz, *Admonitiuncula Horatiana*. Sets forth the right method of criticising classical authors in general and Horace in particular.
- No. 30. *Tragicorum graecorum fragm.* rec. Nauck, ed. II. This edition shows even greater care and caution than ed. I. The number of fragg. has been increased.
- No. 31. Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum frgg.* vol. III. com. frgg. pars II. Deserves the same praise as the preceding volumes.—*Prolegomena de carmine adversus Marcionitas*. Style, metre, birth-place of the unknown author of 'Tertulliani adv. Marcionem libb. V.'
- No. 32. Wide, *de sacris Troezeniorum Hermionensium Epidauriorum comment. acad. Upsala*. Valuable contribution to Greek mythology.—P. Rawack, *De Platonis Timaeo quaest.* Shows that in a number of passages the reading of the testimonia (especially of Proclus's commentary) deserves attention. All variae lectt. of this kind are collected on pp. 40-81.—*Valeri Maximi libb. IX. c. Jul. Paridis et Januar. Nepotiani epitom. it. rec. Kaempf.* Besides cod. Bernens. saec. ix., which formed the basis of Halm's ed., another MS., saec. ix. (of the Ashburnham Library) has been used, which, coming from the same archetype as cod. Bernens., contains a number of passages which are no longer to be read in cod. Bern. The latter has been examined again by K. and some of Halm's statements are corrected. The emendation of text is very careful. Copious apparatus criticus.
- No. 33. *Zosimi, hist. nova*, ed. Mendelssohn (Teubner). Text based on Vat. Cod. Gr. 156, shown by Kiessling to be the archetype of the two extant

MSS. Many happy and convincing conjectures.—Hesselbarth, *Historisch-kritische Untersuchungen zur dritten Dekade d. Livius* (1 Karte). Leaves the main question (relation of Polybius's work to Livy) undecided.

No. 34. Harnack, *Der pseudoepiphanische Tractat de aleatoribus*, &c. Makes the authorship of Victor I. of Rome very probable.—*Aristotelis quæ feruntur de plantis*, &c., ed. Apelt. The importance of the book lies in the edition of 'de Melisso,' the text of which is greatly improved by a new collation of cod. Lipsiens. Unfortunately the collation of other MSS. has been neglected. 'Ventor. sit. et nom.' follows Rose's text; 'de plantis,' 'mechanica,' and 'de lin. insect.' follow Bekker's text. 'De mirab. auscult.' is based on cod. S^a, whether justly can be doubted.—Hoffmann, *Der Codex Medicus Pl. xxxix. N. 1 des Vergilius*. The collation of this MS., which Ribbeck was unable to make, reaches the highest pitch of philological accuracy. Its influence on the text will be slight.

No. 35. *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vols. II. and III. Vol. III. completes the highly interesting account of Dr. Sterrett's

journey in Asia Minor. A great number of errors of former travellers have been corrected; the situation of many towns and of the caput viarum of eastern Galatia, Lystra, Isaura Nova, has been ascertained. The inscriptions are equally important for history, geography and ethnography. It is only to be regretted that modesty prevented the author from giving a fuller account of the incidents of his journey.—*Noni Marcelli compendiosa doctrina*, ed. Luc. Müller, II. Contains the *Adversaria Noniana*. The book is thought to have been written at the time of Diocletian. The MSS. are divided into two classes. I. class represented by cod. Leid., cod. Harleian., and the incomplete cod. Genev. (all three of which have been newly collated); II. class represented by the Wolfenbüttel MS. A good index lemmatum and index auctorum are added.—Holm, *Griechische Geschichte*, II. Gesch. Griechenlands im 5 Jh. v. Chr. In his discussion of the value and credibility of the sources, Holm shows sound judgment. But his method of giving the accounts of the ancient historians unchanged and criticising them in notes can hardly be commended.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

Messrs. King and Cookson have nearly ready for publication by the Clarendon Press a small edition of their work on 'Sounds and Inflections in Greek and Latin.' The new edition is intended principally

for use in schools, and besides comprising most of the matter in the original work, also contains a section on comparative syntax.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aristotle's Ethics*. By Rev. I. Gregory Smith. The Logical Treatises, the Metaphysics, the Psychology, the Politics, by Rev. W. Grundy. 12mo. Christian Knowledge Society. 2s. 6d.
- Cicero*—on Friendship and on Old Age. Literally Translated, with Notes by Cyrus R. Edmonds; with a Biographical Introduction. 12mo. 96 pp. Bell & Son. 1s. and 1s. 6d.
- Daniell* (M. Grant) Exercises in Latin Prose Composition for Schools. Part I., based upon Caesar's *Gallie War*, Books I.-IV. (The Student Series of Latin Classics.) 12mo. pp. 102. Boston (U.S.A.), Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn. 60 c.
- Frost* (W. G.) A Greek Primer: introductory to Xenophon. Boston (U.S.A.), Allyn and Bacon.
- Haigh* (A. E.) The Attic Theatre: a Description of the Stage and Theatre of the Dramatic Performances at Athens. With Facsimiles and Illustrations. 8vo. 380 pp. Frowde. 12s. 6d.
- Ovid Tristia*. Book III. With an Introduction and Notes by S. G. Owen. 12mo. 74 pp. Frowde. 2s.

- Rendall* (G. H.) The Cradle of the Aryans. 8vo. 58 pp. Macmillan. 3s.
- Sellar* (W. Y.) The Roman Poets of the Republic. 3rd Edition, Revised. Post 8vo. 466 pp. Frowde. 10s.
- Virgil*. Aeneid, Book VI. With an Introduction, Notes, and a Vocabulary. Post 8vo. 104 pp. Gill. 1s.
- Virgil*. Aeneid, Book VII.: The Wrath of Turnus. Edited for use of Schools, with Vocabulary by Arthur Calvert. 18mo. 148 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- West* (A. S.) Easy Extracts, for Translation at Sight, from Latin Prose Authors. 3rd Edition. 18mo. 112 pp. Hamilton. 1s.
- Wilson* (J. Cook) On the Interpretation of Plato's Timæus: Critical Studies with special reference to a recent edition. Demy 8vo. 145 pp. D. Nutt. 6s.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis, Books I.-IV. With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by Francis W. Kelsey and Andrew C. Zenos. 12mo. pp. 160. Boston (U.S.A.), Allyn and Bacon. \$1.60.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Berger* (H.) Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen. Abtheilung II. Die Vorbereitungen für die Geographie der Erdkugel. 8vo. xii, 150 pp. Leipzig, Veit & Co. 4 Mk.
- Beschreibung der antiken Münzen in den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Band II. Paeonien, Macedonien, die macedonischen Könige bis Perdiccas III. 12mo. viii, 207 pp. Plates. Berlin, Spemann. 20 Mk.
- Bienwald* (A.) De Crippsiano et Oxoniensi Antiphontis, Dinarchi, Lycurgi codicibus, Inaugural Dissertation. 8vo. 40 pp. Goerlitz. 1 Mk.
- Bisinger* (K.) Funde römische Münzen im Grossherzogtum Baden. 4to. iii, 43 pp. Karlsruhe, Bielefeld. 1 Mk. 60.
- Bucciarelli* (L.) Le due Alceste di Euripide e di Vittorio Alfieri: studio critico. 8vo. 51 pp. Roma, Mantegazza. 75 cent.
- Carini* (J.) Sommario di paleografia. Scritture varie, scrittura latina: appunti per la nuova scuola vaticana. Terza edizione. 8vo. 113 pp. Roma. Tipografia Vaticana. 1888.
- Corradi* (A.) In C. Plinium Caecilium Secundum observationes ad orationem verborumque constructionem et usum pertinentes. 8vo. 57 pp. Bergamo, Gaffuri e Gatti.
- Engelmann* (R.) Bilderatlas zum Homer. Square 8vo. 36 Plates with Text. Leipzig, Verlag des Litterarischen Jahresberichts. Mk. 3.60. Separately: zur Ilias. 20 Plates. Mk. 2. zur Odyssee. 16 Plates. 2 Mk.
- Grundmann* (R.) Ueber 8 in Attika gefundene Henkelinschriften auf griechischen Thongefässen. [Ectr.: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 17. Supplement-Band.] 8vo. 72 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Hausrath* (A.) Philodemi *νεπὶ ποιημάτων* libri secundi quae videntur fragmenta conlegit restituit illustravit A. H. [Ectr.: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 17. Supplement-Band.] 8vo. 66 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Heinze* (R.) De Horatio Bionis imitatore. Dissertatio philologica. 12mo. 32 pp. Bonn. 1 Mk.
- Hermann* und *Weckherlin*. Lateinische Schulgrammatik für untere Gymnasialklassen und höhere Bürger- und Realschulen mit Expositions- und Kompositionstoff, Wörtersammlungen zum Memorieren und einem lateinisch-deutschen und deutsch-lateinischen Wörterbuche. Ausgabe in 1 Bd. 12te verbesserte Auflage von H. A. Hermann und K. Erbe. 12mo. viii, 551 pp. Stuttgart, Metzler. 4 Mk.
- Ihm* (M.) Studia Ambrosiana. [Ectr.: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 17. Supplement-Band.] 8vo. 124 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Igen* (H.) Animadversiones ad L. Annaei Senecae philosophi scripta. Inaugural Dissertation. 4to. 20 pp. Homburg. 60 Pfg.
- Imnisch* (O. Klaros) Forschungen über griechische Stiftungssagen. [Ectr.: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 17. Supplement-Band.] 8vo. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Manfredi* (R. G.) Tieste di Seneca. 8vo. 48 pp. Trani, Vecchi & Co.
- Orosius*. Historiarum adversus paganos libri vii ex recensione C. Zangemeister. 12mo. xxi, 371 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Persius*. Le satire, interpretate dal prof. A. Ronchini. 8vo. x, 169 pp. Parma, M. Adorni.
- Phaedri* fabulae. Für Schüler mit Anmerkungen versehen von J. Siebelis. 6te verbesserte Auflage besorgt von F. Polle. 8vo. xvi, 77 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 75 Pfg.
- Piazza* (G.) Studio critico intorno al Pervigilium Veneris con versione di A. G. Barrili e G. Carducci. 8vo. 77 pp. Trani, Vecchi. 1 l. 50.
- Reiche* (F.) Chronologie der letzten 6 Bücher des Ammianus Marcellinus. Inaugural Dissertation. 8vo. 76 pp. Liegnitz. 80 Pfg.
- Ribbeck* (O.) Geschichte der römischen Dichtung. Band II. Augusteisches Zeitalter. 8vo. iii, 370 pp. Stuttgart, Cotta. 8 Mk. 75.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften von J. Baunack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezzenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, H. Fick, R. Meister, P. Müllensiefen, W. Prellwitz. Herausgegeben von H. Collitz und F. Bechtel. Band III. Heft 3. 8vo. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 Mk. 40.
- Tacitus*. Germania, erläutert von H. Schweizer-Sidler. 5te neu bearbeitete Auflage. 8vo. xviii, 105 pp. Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. 2 Mk.
- Ulrich* (R.) Studia Tibulliana. De libri secundi editione. 8vo. 86 pp. Berlin, Weber. 1 Mk. 80.
- Vogel* (C.) Quaestiones Plutarchae. Inaugural Dissertation. 8vo. 53 pp. Marburg. 1 Mk. 20.
- Voss* (E.) Die Natur in der Dichtung des Horaz. 12mo. 47 pp. Düsseldorf, Voss & Co. 1 Mk.
- Winke, einige, zum Studium der klassischen Philologie von einem Philologen. 8vo. 16 pp. Marburg, Ehrhardt. 30 Pfg.
- Zaniol* (A.) Aurelio Prudenzo Clemente, poeta cristiano: lettura fatta nel seminario patriarcale di Venezia al chiudersi dell'anno scolastico 1888-1889. 8vo. 38 pp. Venezia, Tip. Emiliana.